This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 451Y 8

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

943.83
Corrigan

Se

934.83
Corrigan

Bd. Oct. 1904

LIBRARY

OF THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL

Gift of
Mrs. Henry W. Foote
10 May 1890

(R.C.)
Misc.
P399

What the Catholic Church Most Needs

IN THE UNITED STATES,

OR

THE VOICE OF THE PRIESTS IN THE ELECTION OF THE BISHOPS,

BY

REV. P. CORRIGAN.

This work contains also the History of the now famous pamphlet, "EPISCOPAL NOMINATIONS," which was suppressed by the Bishop of Newark, N. J., at its appearance in June, 1883.

NEW YORK, MAY, 1884.
THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY
AGENTS FOR THE TRADE
39 AND 41 CHAMBERS STREET
PRICE, 50 CENTS.

What the Catholic Church Most Needs

IN THE UNITED STATES,

OR

THE VOICE OF THE PRIESTS IN THE ELECTION OF THE BISHOPS,

BY

REV. P. CORRIGAN.

This work contains also the History of the now famous pamphlet "EPISCOPAL NOMINATIONS," which was suppressed by the Bishop of Newark, N. J., at its appearance in June, 1883.

NEW YORK, MAY, 1884.
THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY,
AGENTS FOR THE TRADE,
39 AND 41 CHAMBERS STREET.
PRICE, 50 CENTS.

LIBRARY OF
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
Gift of
Mrs. Henry W. Foote,
10 May, 1890

COPYRIGHTED BY
REV. P. CORRIGAN,
1884.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUPPRESSED PAMPHLET, "EPISCOPAL NOMINATIONS."

I.—The normal law of the Church gives the Clergy a voice in the election of Bishops—The causes that interfered with the exercise of this right—The Cathedral Chapters.

II.—How the Church labored to maintain this right of the Clergy—The kind of persons she recommended for the Episcopacy.

III.—The condition of the Church in countries where the Clergy were deprived of this right a warning to the Catholics of the United States—This country not obliged to submit to old European Systems; she is entitled to a form of Episcopal Election that best suits her own genius.

IV.—Objections against giving this power to the Priests—If Rome wishes to grant it, what prevents her? If she does not know the condition of the country, why does she not send a Delegate?

V.—Are the Bishops opposed to giving it? Are all the Clergy in favor of it? Do we need Monsignori? Many other questions asked and answered.

VI.—Should the Religious Orders, and especially the Mendicants, Male and Female, be restrained within fixed limits?

VII.—The men we want, and how to get them.

VIII.—The remedy of many evils—The Coming Council—Concluding Remarks, showing that the Priests should get this power, because the Church needs it, the Priests are prepared for it, Catholics and all other denominations favor it, the genius of the country favors it, and Rome is anxious to grant it if the Bishops of the country only ask it.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUPPRESSED PAMPHLET, "EPISCOPAL NOMINATIONS."

This is my second attempt at calling the attention of my fellow-priests to a question of great importance to themselves, and most seriously affecting the interests of the Catholic Church in the United States—the right of the Clergy to a voice in the Election of the Bishops. My first effort partially failed, owing to the suppression by the Bishop of Newark, N. J., in June of 1883, after a thousand copies had been printed, of a pamphlet entitled, Episcopal Nominations. This *suppression was not only a great surprise to myself, but to all the Clergy of the land, for the brochure had been printed and published in the City of New York, and without the slightest objection on the part of the Cardinal, who alone had any right to interfere with publications of his own city.*

I believed then, as I do now, that the question of Episcopal Nominations was a legitimate one for discussion, and though perhaps somewhat delicate ground for a mere Priest to tread upon, I felt that the Church had given me a right to tread upon it, and that I had maintained no position in the pamphlet that conflicted in any manner with the teaching of the Church. The denial of this right of a Priest to discuss in a proper manner a question of vital importance to the Church, and not directly treating of faith or morals, without having previously obtained a formal license to do so, is a thing unknown in this country, and calculated to excite alarm in the minds of those who are most anxious for the future of the Church in America. Hence, though I regarded the action of the Bishop of Newark *as merely local, and in no way expressing the sentiments of the other Bishops of this land*, most of whom are in favor of giving, at least, some say to the Clergy in the choosing of Bishops, still, lest his action should be taken as a *precedent*, and perhaps as a *salutary warning against future reference to this matter by other Priests*, I felt it my duty to the Church in this country, and to the Priests in particular, to protest while I rendered obedience. The spirit of the Church, as well as the spirit of the country, allows a man to maintain his rights, and he is neither a good child of the Church nor a faithful citizen who is afraid to do so. In this

country, at least, *we are entitled to a mild interpretation of odious laws, and so far we have been used to such interpretation.* We are living in the United States, and not in Germany.

My declining to ask a formal license to publish the pamphlet from Ecclesiastical authority argued no want of respect for such authority. I did not consider it imperative on my part, for many reasons; and among them, in my own mind, was the wish to save my own Ordinary, only lately consecrated, from annoyance on the part of the other members of the American Episcopacy, who *would naturally blame one of their youngest brethren for formally sanctioning a movement that aimed at depriving them of their present unlimited power.* I thought this a strong reason at the time, and I think so still. Besides, I was aware that the Bishop himself was actually in favor of giving this very power to the Clergy. It was however, *an open question*, and I had a perfect right to discuss it without asking his special permission, or any person's permission. It would have been foolish for me to ask, and at least most embarrassing for the Bishop to grant, his sanction publicly to a measure that must have been very questionable in the eyes of many of the other Prelates. THE PAMPHLET CONTAINED NOTHING AGAINST THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH. My references to Latin Europe were pretty severe on the want of Catholic life and zeal, even among the Clergy themselves, as compared with those of the United States. They were indeed severe, but none the less true; and I think a little more free use of the lancet would cure many of the diseases of the Church in those lands. Hiding them and laboring to ignore them is hardly the wisest policy. We do not hesitate to throw light upon dark spots in this land; and the result is always in favor of the Church. This is not giving scandal: it is giving the Church fair play. The proof of what I said of lack of proper Catholic life in many parts of Continental Europe, is seen in the lives of those persons amongst us who come from those lands, and whose apathy and perfect indifference to the affairs of the Church, and to the ordinary practice of their *religion*, awake our astonishment and indignation.

WHAT I SAID ON FINANCES.

What I said on the question of Finances and the giving of a share of the management of Church temporalities to the laity. was, in my mind, simply common sense; and I think so still. I was astonished that any fault could be found with it. The sooner, however, these very sentiments are adopted, the better

for the Church in the United States. We have scandals enough arising from mismanagement of Church property, and a stop should be put to them, unless we wish the laity to become totally disgusted. Many things are lawful that are not expedient, at least in the eyes of the Church. Selling *without necessity*—and with the consequent suspicion of money-making attached to the transaction—graveyards, in which rest the bones of the noble immigrants who have built our churches, and whose faithful families still nobly maintain them, is a great crime against the Church, opening wounds that are hard to heal and staggering even the faith of her weaker children. I did not touch on such a delicate theme in the old pamphlet, but some persons are not aware of its importance. The laity who retain profound respect for God's-acre deserve the thanks of Mother Church.

The following is an extract from what I said on *finances*.

"The higher as well as the lower order of the Clergy needs legislation in financial matters. It will injure no diocese to have its accounts properly audited once a year by those in whom the Bishop may have confidence. The great scandals that from time to time shock the whole country are proof against any rashness on my part for making such a suggestion. If we want to benefit the Church, let us make laws for all that require them. In financial affairs we are sadly in need of legislation. We do not acknowledge any right on the part of the people to demand an account of what use we make of their money, but when our inexperience, or our culpable ignorance, has brought shame and scandal on the Church, we very religiously insist that the people should make good the deficit!!! Verily our people so far excel even Job in patience.

"What things a man shall sow those also shall he reap." A time may come, and that before long, when people shall not ask us to give a reasonable account of our stewardship, for they will leave nothing in our hands to be accounted for. After remedies come too late; and we are tempting the people to take the remedies into their own hands, as they have already done in Europe. The same cause will produce the same result under like conditions. This same spirit may have had much to do with the condition of the Church in the great Catholic countries of Europe. Formerly the Clergy had sole control of Church temporal affairs, and the laity had no say at all; now, the other extreme has been reached, where the people have taken all to themselves, and refuse to give to the Priests the very crumbs that fall from the table. It is strange

that we do not see the great evils that flow from the want of proper financial management, or if we do see them, that we fail to apply the proper remedies. It is matters of this kind that make us fear for the future of the Church, and make us feel that the present machinery of the Church in this country is inadequate to its pressing wants."

What I Said on the School Question.

Owing to the fact that very few persons were enabled to procure a copy of the pamphlet on account of the suppression, there was much misunderstanding as to what I said on the school question, and this misunderstanding was increased by reason of some newspaper articles that misrepresented what I really had said. I insert the following letter here which appeared in the *New York Sun* of September 4th, 1883, a paper that has always acted most honorably towards the Catholic Church. As I have always been a very hard worker in behalf of parish schools, I am unwilling to submit to false charges on this score. There is no doubt, however, but that we are losing very large numbers of our children for want of proper attention to their early religious training. It was with the view of remedying this defect that I referred in a special manner to the necessity of instruction *before making their first* communion, for this is neglected in many parts of the Eastern States, where children of all ages are *allowed to go to the public schools*, and are even *compelled* to go, since there is no parochial school at all provided for many of them. This is the evil that I was aiming at. The Western States are doing much better for Catholic education, though we of the East have more wealth. There is one thing we should take for granted, viz.: *that the school is of far more value than the church, and if we fail to provide schools where our faith is taught, we might as well shut up our churches.* Sunday-school is, indeed, a good auxiliary to a day-school, but as a substitute for such, it is a *mere mockery.* I have had too much experience in these matters to be mistaken in what I am saying.

It is true I refrained from applying *harsh terms* to the public schools, and called attention to the fact that *religion is not warred against in the public schools of this country as it is today in so-called great Catholic nations, where religion is positively driven out of the schools and irreligion is positively taught.* Things might be much worse than they are in our public schools. I do not at all say that such schools are fit for Catholic children, who must learn their religion; but I do say that,

continually assailing those institutions with intemperate language is only unnecessarily irritating the American people, who are most friendly to the Catholic Church; and it is creating a spirit of opposition to the Church that may pave the way to persecution. Such intemperance should be stopped; it is only increasing the evil. I used the following words in the article on the school question: "I am not, however, in favor of imprudent legislation that shall cause the Priest to lose control of many members of his flock, and that may eventually tempt the civil authorities to shut up our schools. We must remember that this can be done, and that hasty and unwise legislation may tempt many of our own Catholics to join the civil power in accomplishing it. This *can be done; this has been done where all are* Catholics, in Italy, France and Spain. It has been done in the very city of Rome, while the Pope was calling on us to make education more Christian. Let us act with caution; we may lose all by imprudent zeal. I am not in favor of sending any child to a public school; but I am not in favor of legislation that will drive parents and children out of the Church, and increase our present difficulties tenfold."

The following is the letter already referred to. It was not written till *five weeks* after the charges to which it refers:

A Question in the Catholic Church. A Letter from the Author of the Pamphlet on "Episcopal Nominations."

To the Editor of The Sun—*Sir:* The intelligent and philosophic spirit which your paper has always manifested towards the Catholic Church encourages me to ask space for the correction of certain false impressions that prevail among Catholics regarding a pamphlet called "Episcopal Nominations," addressed by me last June to my fellow-Priests of the United States, but which the Bishop of Newark suppressed after a few hundred copies had appeared.

I wrote the brochure with the purest intentions, for the interests of the Church in this country, after I had seen the lamentable condition of the Church in Italy, France and Spain. The leading idea of the work is contained in a letter of one of the greatest Popes that ever reigned, Pope Leo the Great, wherein he says that no man should be placed as Bishop over a diocese unless he is acceptable to the Priests and the people.

Some of the laity are not perhaps aware that, according to the law of the Church, no book written by a Catholic, no matter what subject it treats of, history, geography, or even

agriculture, may be printed without its formal approbation or *imprimatur* of the Bishop in whose diocese the printing is done. Any Bishop may invoke this law at his pleasure, but it is seldom done, except in the case of works that treat of faith and morals. The rigid laws regarding printing of books have been modified very much by custom even in Catholic countries. In this country there are many instances where books that treat even of faith and morals are printed and sold by Catholics without any episcopal permission or *imprimatur*, and without any hindrance on the part of the Bishops. Two of the most distinguished Priests of the Diocese of Newark published books treating even of faith and morals under Bishop Corrigan, who is perhaps as well acquainted with the requirements of the law as any other man in the country, and as anxious to enforce them. In fact, to such an extent has the law governing the publication of books fallen into abeyance in this country, that certain Catholic laymen well known to their Bishops are largely interested in the printing and selling of Protestant books written against the Catholic Church, and this, too, without any action being taken, as far as I am aware, against them by the Bishops.

I know that two wrongs do not make a right. I refer to these facts simply to show what little reason I had for apprehending any unfavorable action with regard to the pamphlet.

I do not, however, complain of the suppression of the work, for it is strictly within the letter of the law. I have even submitted to things in connection with the suppression which no law required of me, in the hope of being allowed to publish it with whatever eliminations the Bishop or his censors might suggest. This request, however, which might have resulted in a clear vindication of my orthodoxy by the pamphlet itself, was not granted.

To add to my ill fortune, the amount of episcopal discipline which the suppression necessarily carried with it, and which, under the circumstances, was amply sufficient to vindicate the law, has been largely increased by two newspaper interviews, the one with the Very Reverend Chancellor of the Diocese, and the other with the Bishop himself. The former charges that "some of the positions taken in the pamphlet were not in accordance with the teachings of the Church on these matters," and the latter that "Father Corrigan says that a Catholic child may, after its first communion, attend these schools [public schools] with safety." I simply deny the very serious charge of the Chancellor, who has given no proof that such positions are maintained in the pamphlet. I also deny the

other charge, for there is no such proposition in my pamphlet.

My whole life has been spent in building and maintaining parish schools. I have now a free school of more than 900 children, where only a few years ago I found hardly half that number, and this, too, while I am struggling under a debt of more than $90,000. I did say in the pamphlet: "I am, of course, in favor of parish schools, and, with all my experience of parish and of public schools, I cannot see how any Priest can think otherwise without betraying the best interests of religion. I believe that the school-house is of far more vital importance to a parish than the church-edifice. I am not in favor of sending any child to a public school." These are my very words, and yet I am represented as favoring the sending of Catholic children to the public schools in order to throw odium on the pamphlet.

If I did lay special emphasis on the necessity of sending children to parish schools, before their first communion, it was not that I favored sending them afterward to the public schools, but because of the facility with which tens of thousands of them are virtually compelled to go to these schools in their most tender years, and long before they are capable of making their first communion. I am working in the true interest of those poor children who have at present no chance of even a minimum of religious training, and who seem to be forgotten in our cry for a higher education. If it is wrong to send our children to what we are calling "godless schools," why do we continue to send them?

What I did not say in the pamphlet I say now: that either the ecclesiastical authorities of certain places believe the danger to the faith of the children attending these schools is remote, or a great wrong is being done the children. But whether the danger be remote or not, at least some substitute for a parish school should be provided, and the children kept in it till they acquire some smattering of their religion; and then, if we will not, or cannot, do more, let us say honestly to the children who have no alternative but the public school that our want of school room, or our lack of qualified teachers for children of all ages, compels us to acknowledge a *modus vivendi* for the grown, up boys and girls who attend the public schools. This would be a lesser evil, if, indeed, an evil, than the present state; for we must remember that here in the East there are great cities where the provision for Catholic training is so limited that if the public schools were to close to-morrow there would be hardly room for the children who have not yet made their first communion. This is not merely in poor dis-

tricts contemplated by the instruction of 1875 from Rome, but in many of our rich parishes, where grand churches show what we could do, if we would, for parish schools.

I do not say this is general in the East, but it is too often the case. It was with such facts before me that I said some relgious instruction should be provided for every child, at least before its first communion; but I nowhere advocated sending children to public schools before or after their first communion.

The question of education was only incidentally referred to in the pamphlet, but the public was given to understand that its mode of treatment by me was the real cause of the opposition to the pamphlet. This can hardly be true, for my request to publish it with the question on education left out was refused. Apart from this, I am not informed myself of the real cause of the suppression. P. CORRIGAN, Rector.

THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF GRACE, HOBOKEN, Aug. 25.

THE REAL QUESTION OF THE PAMPHLET, OR THE ELECTION OF THE BISHOPS BY THE CLERGY OR A CERTAIN QUALIFIED NUMBER OF THE CLERGY.

To my mind the real, though not the specific objection against the pamphlet, was the leading idea of the work, or the nomination of the Bishops by the Priests; and this objection seems to have had another source than the Bishop himself, for I offered more than once, though without a shadow of success, to purchase *non-interference* on his part by the elimination of everything to which he or his censors might object. This, to my mind, seemed sufficient to remove his own scruples; and this the more so *as the work had not been printed or published within his jurisdiction; and the authority who alone had a right to interfere, according to the laws of the Church, had made no objection at all against the pamphlet.*

As I engaged in a cause that I was well aware would meet with little favor on the part of the Episcopacy, and also on the part of many of those of the Clergy who float from diocese to diocese, and who prefer potluck in our present imperfect system of church discipline, to most uncertain fortune for such men, under well-established law, I made up my mind to submit to any amount of annoyance that did not compromise the cause itself. Hence I refrained from saying a single word publicly or privately in criticism of the Bishop's interpretation of the law, or of his manner of applying it; and I took no notice at all of a very indecent personal attack by a *certain*

notorious clerical character, whom I had most charitably befriended on three different occasions. This person is not what some New York paper mistakenly called him, "a distinguished New Jersey Priest," though he has certainly "distinguished" himself at all points of the ecclesiastical compass. There is no better or more high-toned body of Priests in the United States, "than the New Jersey priests," and the attack of this *stranger* is not calculated to impair my standing among them. I mention this matter for the sake of those who may have read the article, and whose respect for the word of "a distinguished New Jersey Priest" may give them wrong ideas of the motives of the author of "Episcopal Nominations," and consequently may injure the cause itself. Though I had no reason to propitiate my fellow-Priests of New Jersey, I did anticipate objections on the part of strangers, by inserting the following opening remarks to the old pamphlet, at the no small risk of offending modesty, or, at least, of creating a smile where I was totally unknown. This is what I said, and I trust I shall be pardoned for having said it, for, in my own mind, I *am neither a poet nor a fool, as some may be tempted to imagine.*

Rev. and Dear Sir:—As I am calling your most earnest attention to a matter of great moment to the Church in this country, and as such a course is seldom taken by a mere Rector, who has other things at heart than his own real or imaginary grievances, I deem it proper to say a word about myself, before asking you to risk any loss of time in reading this document.

I have no grievance against people, Priests or Bishops; I feel the same interest in the welfare of the Church that you do yourself. I believe that I have at heart the real honor and glory of the Church in the United States. Hence, I have not the remotest idea of causing scandal; I am aware, however, that in matters of great importance some things are necessary that fail to meet the approbation of every person, and that very poor instruments may sometimes suffice for the beginnings of the noblest undertakings.

Leaving Ireland before entering on my *teens*, and ordained in Baltimore, in 1860 for New Jersey, where I have since labored in the Diocese of Newark with no small success, I can not be accused of having *native prejudices*, while at the same time all my sympathies are American. I have been successively pastor of four of the largest Congregations of the Diocese, one of which, St. Peter's Church, of Jersey City, I gave to the

Jesuits * on the sole condition that they should build a college in the parish. The college has been built. A labor of twenty-three years in the very heart of great Catholic populations, and within one mile of the City of New York, seventeen of those years spent in building churches and schools, is a guarantee that I am pretty well acquainted with the real wants of the mission. The great interest that I have always taken in schools, and the sacrifice that I made (humanum dico) in giving up, of *my own free will, one of the wealthiest parishes of the diocese for this sole purpose*, show that I am aware of the fact that the question of Education is the question of questions for the Catholics of this country.

I mention these matters not for any silly vanity or weakness, but by way of anticipating the hasty criticisms of those who perhaps have had much less experience than myself, and who may have done very little, if any, of the real hard work of the mission.

I might say more, though you may think I have already said too much. However, this will suffice for those who may have no other means of satisfying their minds as to the character of the person who presumes to address them on a matter which, in the ordinary course of events, seems entirely beyond the province of a mere Priest.

The subject is indeed a delicate one; *but we can hardly expect the Bishops themselves to take the initiative.* I do not at all presume to place the matter before you in its best light. I am not capable of doing so. I simply undertake to sow the seed; others, I trust, will cultivate and reap the harvest. The mere preliminary step may easily be followed, if necessary, by a proper organization, the branches of which will extend to every diocese, in order to obtain the sentiments of all the Bishops and the Priests of the land.

There is no better way of informing the Bishops of the real wants of the Church in all parts of the country than by ascertaining the opinions of all the Priests, who, on account of

* I mean that *it was myself that conceived the idea of giving my parish to the Jesuits*, and that I induced Bishop Bayley to sanction it. I may add that some years after that, I gave up St. Mary's Church, Jersey City, and came to an inferior parish in Hoboken, solely in order to extricate Bishop Corrigan from the financial difficulties which resulted from the attempt to build the great church of Hoboken; and after I had succeeded in building that church and had made the financial condition of the church most flourishing. I volunteered during the past year to go to St.....Parish, and to begin work a new by laying the foundation of a church. I know it is against all rule and modesty to sing self-praises, but I have reason for doing so, as I have already remarked.

their intimate knowledge of the people, may be regarded as the very pulse of the Church, whose touch tells the beating of her heart. That such knowledge would be a great desideratum for the Bishops is beyond doubt; that it would lead to the adoption of the proposed measure is more than likely.

The whole matter rests with the Bishops, *for it is certain that* Rome *will grant this power to the Priests, if the* Bishops *think it for the best interests of the Church in this country.* This is a great point gained, and we should not forget it. Though we cannot use the words in their full significance, still, by way of anticipation, we may say: "*Roma locuta est Causa finita est.*"

I believe it is the best of all plans for the present condition of the Church and for her future prospects in this country. It will certainly give her an element of strength which she needs just now, by securing the co-operation of a majority of the Priests, and consequently of the laity. This is a most serious point, and we do not always secure it with our present system. It will also put an end to the many causes of discontent that are manifesting themselves in various sections of the country, not only between people and Priests, but also between the Priests and the Bishops, for it will give us men of experience on the mission, who are thoroughly acquainted with the Priests and the people. That the wisest and most experienced among Priests and laity will be enthusiastically in favor of such a proposition may be regarded as a foregone conclusion; that some of our Bishops are in favor of it. I am certain, and it may be taken for granted that the whole non-Catholic population, already so favorably disposed towards the Church, from the humblest citizen to the President of the United States, will regard with satisfaction a measure so calculated to harmonize the discipline of the Catholic Church with the genius and the institutions of this great representative country.

To those who find fault with me for agitating this question, I can only say that I think it will be a great blessing to the Church, and that every Priest should enter into this matter with heart and soul in order to show the Bishops the real sentiments of the whole Church, and thus to enable them to decide wisely in a matter of vital importance to us all."

In my relations with my Bishop there has not been the slightest personal feeling, for though each took a different view of the same subject, both acted most conscientiously and for the greater good of religion. I not only submitted to what the law did not require of me—in order to avoid scandal—but I *refrained from taking advantage of certain newspaper inter-*

views, in which I was treated by authority with unnecessary freedom; nay, more, I *even restrained my friends from writing one single word in reference to those newspaper and extra-judicial charges, lest the remotest occasion should be given to lessen, either publicly or privately, that reverence which I have always manifested towards the spiritual head of the diocese.* As I had most scrupulously avoided all newspaper interviews myself (not an easy matter under the circumstances), and rendered them totally unnecessary on the part of others by my absolute silence, justice and charity justify me in freeing myself from those extra-judicial and newspaper charges of having advanced propositions contrary to the teaching of the Church, after having waited silently and patiently for more than *ten months* in the vain hope of their being withdrawn.

A letter which I received from one of the most eminent Cardinals of Rome, to whose judgment I referred the matter of the orthodoxy of the pamphlet, praises the good spirit of the author of the pamphlet, and has no fault whatever to find with its orthodoxy. It was the same Cardinal who blamed the "violence" of the suppression of the work. I must confess that my asking the Cardinal whether it contained any thing contrary to the teaching of the Church is the only real humiliation that I experienced in the whole history of the affair; for I felt that I was asking the great Roman theologian a very silly question, and giving him most ample cause to smile at the theological lore of Uncle Sam. I took the precaution, however, to tell him that I did not ask the question for my own information, or for that of the other Priests of the United States.

How the Pamphlet was received in Rome.

A most special providence seems to have watched over the little pamphlet now so famous in the history of the Church in this country, and destined to influence in no small degree its future history. The open and manly hostility of the Bishop of Newark, far from injuring the cause of the pamphlet, only seemed to call the attention of all the ecclesiastical authorities of this country to it, and to make it known even to the Cardinals of the very City of Rome. I have every reason, then, to feel grateful for this result; and I have hardly any cause to find fault with the attempts of those who employed other means than the open ones of my own Ordinary to lessen the influence of the pamphlet in Rome. This latter attempt, however, is the occasion of my repeating so much of my *own personal history* from the old pamphlet, a thing which some per-

sons may severely blame, as an outrage on modesty. I do it in order to show Rome that I am not the kind of man that I have been represented by a few who are anxious to destroy the real influence that the pamphlet has produced in Rome. I may say with regard to the reception of the work in Rome, that the principal reason why I *now* discontinue my efforts to obtain a *formal approbation* of the work by the Propoganda is the favorable manner in which it has been received in Rome, and my own unwillingness to cause any annoyance by a decision which I am certain must be in my favor as to the dogmatic soundness of the pamphlet. There WAS NOTHING IN IT CONTRARY TO THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH, and this is from the lips of one of the most eminent of the Cardinals of the Propaganda.

I knew before writing the work that my advocacy of the right of the Clergy to a voice in the election of Bishops would find favor at Rome. Rome, with her divine instincts, has the correct idea of what this country wants. She is not only in favor of giving Priests this vote, but she is anxious to give it, and if she were only sure of the exact state of this country, she would insist on giving the Clergy this power.

How the Bishops received It.

Its reception by many of the Bishops of the country has not been unfavorable. There are certainly many of the most leading members of the Episcopacy in favor of giving the Clergy some say in the choosing of Bishops. There are, however, others, and they not at all the ablest, or even the abler ones, who are intensely opposed to it. I am not aware that a single *representative* Bishop of the whole country found fault with what I said in the pamphlet regarding the defects of our present system of electing Bishops. One or two persons mistakenly imagined that I referred to them, and that the pamphlet was dictated by mere personal motives. They are totally mistaken. I had something more in view than such a trifle, that would be quite unworthy of a Priest. I must confess, however, that the *knowledge of certain things which only had reference to one or two cases may have added to my warmth of expression in some parts of the old pamphlet, as well as of the new one.* Real love for the Church loses respect and even patience with ecclesiastical ambition that only makes itself the more offensive by protestations of disinterestedness that are made to conceal it, and that employs the lips in loud cries for strict ecclesiastical discipline, while in the very act of seeking, through other than ecclesiastical methods or even ecclesias-

tual persons, that position which is only for those who are called by God through the established laws of His Church.

If, then, any shade of such meaning manifests itself in what I say, it must refer to this, and this alone; and in no manner even to a very small number of persons. There is no more humbler nor more zealous body of Bishops in the world than the American Bishops. My meaning in the old as well as in the new pamphlet is, that a changed system of electing our Bishops would give us men whose knowledge of the needs of the Church, and whose personal influence among Clergy and laity, would enable them to wield all the moral force of the diocese. We have many such men now; but there are many, again, who, though acting to the best of their ability, are unable to fulfill these requirements. I must not, then, be understood as finding fault with the Episcopacy; *the fault is with the system that fails to give us the best men; and the Church in this country is entitled to the best men; and Priests and people should insist on getting them. The Priests know them best, and hence they should be allowed to choose them.* If it is wrong to advocate this, then I am doing wrong.

How the Clergy and the Laity received It.

The reception of the pamphlet by the Clergy and laity was most enthusiastic. The hundreds of letters that reached me from all quarters, from Priests, lawyers, newspaper editors, literary men, and even from pious nuns, told me plainly that I had touched the proper chord, and that I had made no mistake in the effect which I had intended the work to produce. Those letters were perhaps one of the most correct expressions of the real feeling of the Clergy and laity that could possibly be obtained. To give an idea of the tone of those communications, I will quote a few lines from one of them. It is from one of the most distinguished Catholic laymen in the United States.

"Rev. Dear Sir—I got hold of your pamphlet yesterday, and notwithstanding the heat, I did not leave my office until I read it through. I am glad to find that there is one Priest in the country not afraid to speak out and make known the sufferings of God's Church in this country. * * * Now, as you have opened the door, do not desist until you see your ideas carried out. May God spare you to do His holy will."

It was, indeed, no small consolation to find the general verdict, not alone of the Catholics, but also of those most friendly to the Church, though not of her communion, in favor of the step I had taken, and in praise of the substance, tone, and opportuneness of "Episcopal Nominations."

Since the appearance of the pamphlet I have spoken to many of the most distinguished Priests of the country, and I have not found one who did not fully agree with what I said on the question of electing the Bishops. I may say the same in regard to many prominent laymen with whom I have spoken. They all feel that our present system of nomination needs a change. Let the Clergy feel, however, that *proper exertions* on their part will effect a remedy. They are most anxious that the *really representative* men of the Clergy should govern them; it will be their own fault if this is not the case. Let the *really representative Priests* of *each Diocese* interest themselves in this movement, before it is too late, and what our own Bishops assembled at the coming Council in Baltimore may hesitate to ask for us from Rome, *we ourselves, by prudent and united action*, may obtain from the same Rome.

A petition from a few of the representative Pastors of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Brooklyn, Boston and Chicago—which may be said to represent all the country—would have great weight at the Council and would be looked upon in Rome as the real voice of the Priests. There is no doubt but such a petition, asking a vote for the Priests in Episcopal elections, would be kindly received at Rome, though it may be taken for granted that it would meet with small favor at home.

I think I have said enough about "Episcopal Nominations," and that it is ample time to begin the preface to the new brochure. Unless circumstances should render it necessary, there will hardly be any future action taken to disurb the final and honored repose of the little production that has done much good, in bringing this very inportant question of appointing Bishops fairly before the whole Church of the United States. The new pamphlet will materially strengthen the position I took on this question by its proofs from the Popes, the Fathers of the Church, and General Councils.

PREFACE.

According to the present mode of electing the Bishops of the United States, the Bishops of the province or section of the country to which the vacant diocese belongs send the names of three persons to Rome, from which the Pope selects the one who is to be Bishop. The *Clergy of the vacant diocese have absolutely no say at all in the matter*, the very knowledge of the names sent to Rome being scrupulously kept from them by the Bishops. What the Clergy of this country now ask is, that the Parish Priests have the power from Rome of designating the three names—as they have in Irelnnd—subject, if necessary, to the veto of the Bishops, though this veto-power is not retained by the Irish Bishops. If this is not given them, they should, at any rate, have a *substantial say* in the nominating of the Bishops.

This power of merely nominating which the Irish Priests enjoy, and which the Popes have given in nearly all ages of the Church to kings, has nothing to do with the power of *creating* or *consecrating* Bishops, which belongs to the Episcopacy alone, and which can not be alienated. If real active union is to be secured and maintained for the Church in the United States, there seems to be no reason why this power should be denied to the Clergy, and every reason why it should be granted to them as soon as possible. Let me quote here what I said in the old pamphlet:

"You may say it makes very little difference to a Bishop whether the Priests or the people are satisfied with his appointment. It makes a very great difference to the Church, and this fact is making itself felt very materially in many parts of the country. It is all very well to say that Priests and people should always cheerfully submit to those whom the Church has placed to rule them. This should be so, and would be so, and if it is not always the case, it is in a great measure owing to the system which renders it very difficult. Men are not always chosen who are identified with the country and with the majority of the people who have built up religion and who are still its

main support. If we have a choice of plans, we should choose the best. The men chosen by the Priests will always have a majority of Priests and people to support them, and no matter what feelings of nationality may at first be felt, they will soon vanish after the will of the greater number shall have been made known. This is a representative country, and we are used to submit without grumbling to the decision of the majority, so that the giving of this power to the Priests will tend to do away with feelings of nationality, and not to increase them. With our present system, we seldom have a respectable minority satisfied; and hence we create these bitter disappointments that militate against the growth of the Church. Our present system *ignores ex professo the will of the Priests*, and makes it even impossible for them to exercise any scrutiny as to the moral, or intellectual, or business qualifications of the person into whose hands are to be committed the destinies of the diocese. So strict is the secrecy observed in sending the names to Rome, that the very Priests who have spent themselves in building up the Church cannot obtain an inkling of who is to be their Bishop. But, perhaps, they would criticise him too severely if they were to know him, and thus prevent his nomination. I think the man whose character cannot stand a severe criticism is hardly the best man for a Bishop; and I think that it were much better to prevent his nomination by proper representations to Rome than to be sending these representations when it is too late.

"It is thought better to stifle all dissatisfaction by announcing the names after the confirmation has taken place, when the fear of giving scandal, and the stringent laws of the Church governing such matters are regarded as proof against unfavorable public comments. This, however, is hardly the wisest plan, for it only intensifies dissatisfaction and causes many of the Priests and the laity to lose heart in their work, on account of charges of insubordination from their spiritual head, whose piety, and learning, and good intentions, are outweighed by his want of experience in the management of the great interest which their prudence and liberality have given to the Church."

In advocating then, the right of the Clergy to a voice in the election of the Bishops, I am simply claiming what the ancient law of the Church justifies; what the great changes now so seriously affecting the moral world de

mand; what is most in keeping with the best instincts of our own country; and what the laity, the Clergy and many of the Bishops regard as the most effective remedy for the numerous difficulties of the American Church that are now imperatively demanding a speedy solution. The question of the right of the Clergy to a voice in Episcopal nominations has a special interest for the Priesthood of the United States, where the civil power is not opposed to their acquiring it, as it is in some parts of Europe; and this interest is intensified just now by the approach of the contemplated Plenary Council at Baltimore. It is well known that Rome is willing to grant the Clergy any share in the choosing of the Bishops that the Fathers of the coming Council may deem for the best interests of the Church.

The normal law of the Church which gives them a voice in such elections has been hitherto suspended by Rome in regard to the American Priests, owing to the missionary character of the country. The missionary or temporary form of government, however, is about to cease. The late meeting of the American Archbishops at Rome, though having for its object the mere outlining of legislation necessary for this change, gives us to understand, by the tone and the acts of the distinguished Prelates, that the American Episcopacy is not only *competent, but even anxious, if permitted, to assume full control of all domestic legislation.*

If the Bishops, then, are capable of discharging their full obligations, we have every reason to suppose that the same may be true of the Clergy; and if the time has come for the Bishops to speak out with such marked emphasis, it certainly has come for the Priests.

The present pamphlet is intended to show the Priests that they have a right to this power by the laws and the practice of the Church, and that it is their own fault if they fail to obtain it in this country. Rome is on the side of the Clergy, and she leaves the decision of the matter in the hands of the Bishops. Rome will find no fault with the Clergy for *agitating* this question, provided the *really representative* Priests unite in the movement and act with due moderation and prudence. It is a great question for the United States, and also for Canada. We must help Rome, for she wants to do what is for the greatest good of the Church; and this, in the estimation of all the Priests who thoroughly understand the Church of America, is the proper remedy for most of our troubles. We

are continually calling for union among all ranks of the Church. This is the best means of securing this union.

In agitating this question, I have nothing at heart but the real good of the Church, pure and simple, whatever some persons may say to the contrary.

I am no alarmist. I am only anxious to see proper remedies applied to certain tendencies to disunion that are manifesting themselves between Bishops and Priests, and between people and Clergy. If I do appear over bold and almost wanting in due reverence for the established order of things in this country, I must not be accused of want of proper regard for authority. My whole ecclesiastical career is opposed to such a charge. I have always anticipated the slightest wish of my Bishop. Humanly speaking, I am not benefiting myself in what I am now doing, I am not looking to self; I am aiming at the good of the Church—only looking to the future. My *apparent boldness is the result of the lamentable state of the Church, which I saw with my own eyes in* 1882, *on Continental Europe, and of the oft-repeated call of the Pope for stronger union among Catholics.* Our *own happy condition* in this country may be maintained and increased by the changed mode of electing our Bishops. The Catholics of Europe are much to be blamed for their apathy in Church affairs. Let us seek the best means of insuring lasting union; let us not hesitate to seek it earnestly and persistently, in season and out of season. This is *my own state of mind, and is the key to what may appear to some, perhaps, mere presumption.* I am acting honestly, and, if not much mistaken, even prudently. Of course, timorous people may think otherwise; but *timorous people are much to be blamed for many evils that are allowed to injure the Church through fear of calling attention to them.* The Pope himself has been for many years, as he is to-day, a prisoner where no Turk or heretic holds sway, in Italy itself; nay, in the very City of Rome; and he has not dared to appear in the very streets of his his own city where the robber-king of Sardinia rules supreme, and insults him, with the consent and the applause of 27,000,000 of Italian Catholics, while Austria, France and Spain look on with cold indifference. Was there no nation to command the robber to take his hands off the property of the Church but the far-off and so-called infidel land of the West—the United States! "Hands off the American College! it is the property of American Catholics." These were the words of the

United States, as influenced by her few Catholic subjects. Had the Catholics of Latin Europe the same independent spirit as we of the United States, the Church would not be suffering as she is to-day. Where is the hold of Bishops over Clergy, or of Clergy over laity, in these so-called Catholic nations? Give us of America the means of securing that hold on Clergy and laity that no demagogue, that no political revolution can injure or destroy. Give us this, and there will always be Catholics that are Catholics in the United States.

The systems of worn-out and anti-Christian Europe are before us in their more than lamentable results. Let us have the REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM that is forcing itself irresistibly upon the whole civilized world, wherever there are men to rule and subjects to obey. It is the ancient law and practice of the Church of God, and it is the system most in keeping with the very genius of America. Is it *wrong* to ask this? Is it *imprudent* to insist upon it? Is it not the duty of every Priest, the right of every layman, to labor for this end? Let us not wait too long. Let our superiors have patience and trust to our loyalty —*boldness* is not *imprudence.* Let them refuse us freedom to speak, even where the Church leaves us free, and in a comparatively short time we shall have no voice or no will to use it for the defense of the Church—we shall be as the Catholics of Latin Europe are to-day, cowards, a disgrace to Mother Church.

CHAPTER I.

1. THE NORMAL LAW OF THE CHURCH GIVES THE CLERGY A VOICE IN THE ELECTION OF THE BISHOPS. 2. THE CAUSES THAT INTERFERED WITH THIS RIGHT OF THE CLERGY. 3. THE CATHEDRAL CHAPTERS.

I. The normal law of the Church from the days of the Apostles down to the present time, when uninfluenced by political or other outside pressure, has always given the Priests a substantial say in the election of the Bishops, and has, moreover, insisted, that no one should be made a Bishop unless he was acceptable to the laity. So rigidly was this law enforced in the early ages of the Church, that the Popes themselves called a man an *intruder* who had been placed over a Diocese without the choice of the Priests and the desire of the laity. They pronounced the consecration of such a one *unlawful*, and declared that the people were not bound to receive him, though he had been consecrated for their diocese: "*Nullus invitis detur Episcopus; cleri, plebis et ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur.*" These are the words of Pope Celestine I., and they are the sentiments of the other Popes and Fathers of the Church: "Let no Bishop be placed over those who are unwilling to receive him; it is not only necessary that the Priests and the people consent to receive him, but that they should also desire him as their Bishop."

In the choice of Bishops, the Church, which has always aimed at harmony and efficiency, has ever sought the men who had already gained the confidence and the affections of Priests and people, and had thus made them willing instruments in advancing her holy work. Though often obliged, after the first few centuries of her existence, to modify her laws respecting Episcopal nominations, in order to meet the exigencies of the pagan world and its numerous semi-civilized rulers; and though constrained in after years, and even up to the present day, through fear of greater evils and loss of souls, to yield to the encroachments and the tyranny of Christian rulers, whether Catholic or Protestant, she ever reminded them of her ancient law and of her firm resolve to return to that law when circumstances would permit. This is written upon every page of her history. Whenever the secular power sought to influence

or to control the election of the Bishops, the voice of Christ's Vicar was raised in loud protest; and when necessary, the united voice of the Universal Episcopacy spoke in the General Councils of the Church and defined the limits of civil jurisdiction. This became necessary from the fact that interference on the part of the State in Episcopal nominations was coeval with the earliest Christian rulers.

The freedom of these elections was at the bottom of nearly all the great struggles between the Church and the State during what was called the Middle Ages, from the fifth to the fifteenth century. The violent contest that rages to-day between Rome and Germany recalls most forcibly the memorable struggle of the same powers in the eleventh century, when Gregory VII. refused to Henry IV. of Catholic Germany, what Leo XIII. refuses to the Protestant Emperor of infidel Germany to-day.

Now, as then, the Church is willing to make concessions when the need of souls demands them; but the sad experience of the past influence of the civil power in the appointment of Bishops has not been forgotten by the Church, and she is gradually but surely returning to the old Apostolic law which gives the Church, and the Church alone, the appointment of her own officers. This is her right. The spirit ofthe present age is in favor of liberty; and why should not the Church be free to act according to her own constitution, which she has received from the hands of Christ himself? The State has always labored to control the Church; it has endeavored to absorb her, to divide her, and even to annihilate her; but the Church has ever claimed her right to exist in her own personality, independent of all mere human power. Her mission is to save souls, and she alone, and not the State, is the proper judge of the means for attaining that end. She insists on her freedom, and though the State by physical force may deprive her of that freedom, she still continues her mission, though with less perfect means, protesting and struggling against mere brute force.

2. The Causes that Interfered with this Right of the Clergy.

Some persons are ever ready to blame the Church for all her difficulties with the State without having examined the real causes of those difficulties. The great political power and wealth enjoyed by the Bishops for more than a thousand years, were only the indirect result of causes most honorable

to the Church, and causes to which all the nations of Europe owe their present civilization. Neither the political power, nor its consequent wealth, was originally sought, or even desired, by the Bishops; and both became the occasion, if not the cause. of most of the troubles of the Church, inasmuch as they tended to separate the Bishops from the Priests, as well as from the people. The power and wealth of the Prelates came to them as marks of gratitude for the noble sacrifices which the Church had made in her efforts to civilize and to Christianize the barbarous tribes that poured themselves in countless numbers over the ruins of the old Roman Empire.

The Church was the only moral power that survived the destruction of that great empire. To her fell the mighty task of taming the fierce warriors whose ideas of law and morality were regulated by the power of the sword and the voice of their unbridled passions; and whose contempt for letters was so complete that even their very kings boasted that they were unable to write their names.

Hallam acknowleges the services the Church rendered to civilization when he says: "The Bishops acquired and retained a great part of their ascendency by a very respectable instrument of power, intellectual superiority. They alone were acquainted with the art of writing; and they were intrusted with political correspondence and with the framing of the laws. They alone knew the elements of a few sciences, and the education of royal families devolved upon them as a necessary duty. In the fall of Rome their influences upon the barbarians wore down the asperity of conquest, and saved the provinces half the shock of that tremendous revolution. As captive Greece is said to have subdued her Roman conqueror, so Rome in her own turn of servitude cast the fetters of a moral captivity upon the fierce invaders of the north. Chiefly through the exertions of the Bishops, whose ambition may be forgiven for its effects, her religion, her language, in part even her laws, were transplanted into the courts of Paris and Toledo, which became a degree less barbarous by imitation." The learning, then, the prudence, and the piety, of the Bishops, was the foundation of the great European nations of to-day; a debt which most, if not all, of them, seem to forget.

These great results, however, were not accomplished without much spiritual loss to the Church. The great secular responsibilities were followed by the wealth with which the various nationalities rewarded the great services of the Bishops, and this wealth in its turn was followed by a loss of zeal on the part of the Bishops, many of whom became more inter-

ested in the affairs of the State than in those of the Church. The office of Bishop became, in course of time, on account of the great wealth attached to it, the object of the ambition of worldly-minded men. Hence we often find mere boys of fifteen years of age, the sons of noble families, appointed to rule the Priests and the people.

Let us quote from Alzog's History of the Church, vol. 2, p. 98: "The *evil* which came upon the Church by reason of her connection with the feudal system will more than balance the good. The distinction between things sacred and profane was gradually lost sight of; Ecclesiastics became the vassals of kings, and as such mingled with the worldly and shared their dissipations. Then were sown the seeds of the long and terrible struggle between the Throne and the Altar, the Church and the Empire. Even the appointments to Bishoprics, which, according to ecclesiastical canons, should have been the result of the concurrent choice of the Bishops of the province, and of the Clergy and laity of each Diocese, were *wholly dependent upon the arbitrary will of princes.* Whatever qualifications men so appointed may have possessed, they were not, at any rate, such as would recommend them as fit persons to preside over the destinies of the Church. They were courtiers, and not Ecclesiastics. Having received their appointments, they were hastily promoted to Holy Orders, without regard to the rule of the Church, requiring the observance of the interstices. Moreover, as those who held land in fief became by this very fact the vassals of princes, such, when appointed to Bishoprics and Abbotships, were required to take an oath, not only of personal but also of feudal fealty to their liege lord, by which they bound themselves to serve the king in war, to appear at court when commanded to do so, to assist at his tribunals, and to remain subject to his jurisdiction. Again, since *every free-born man* among the Germans *was liable to military duty*, and could not enter either the clerical or monastic state without the permission of the Government, it was necessary to recruit the ranks of the Clergy from among those who, formerly serfs, had been set free by the Church. Owing to their former inferior condition, they were often kept in a humiliating state of dependence by Bishops, who owed their appointments to the favor of princes, and who were naturally proud of their rank and fortune." This gives us one of the strongest reasons why the power of taking part in Episcopal nominations was gradually withdrawn from the Priests. At first the ambition of their immediate rulers, lay as well as ecclesiastical, denied them a voice in Episcopal

elections, and then having deprived them of their rights, they so degraded them morally and intellectually, that even the Church herself was obliged to withold from them the exercise of this power, or entrust it only to a few of those best qualified to use it, such as the members of Chapters. Those *who are opposed to giving the Priests of the United States the voice in Episcopal elections should remember that arguments drawn from the fact that the Church in past ages withheld or limited this power of the Priests, are very poor indeed when applied to the present day and especially to the Priests of this country* And yet the arguments we hear to-day rest on this very foundation, though we are neither "serfs" nor slaves, nor dependent upon any secular lord. So great were these abuses, that Pope Pascal II. in the beginning of the twelfth century, in a letter to Henry V. of Germany, offered to relinquish all those worldly honors and emoluments of the Bishops to the secular power on the sole condition that the secular authority should abandon all claim to the appointing of Bishops. Most of the Bishops, however, were content to remain in comparative servitude to the civil power for the sake of the benefice or revenue attached to their offices.

So far had the State gone in its encroachments on the Church, that kings insisted on the right of nominating every Bishop within their dominions; and some of them went so far as to prohibit even the ordination of Priests without their permission. Even the Pope himself had to pay a fee to the Emperors of the East for his election, until it was remitted by Constantine IV., in 668. The Emperors of Germany claimed, and, on some occasions, exercised, the right of confirming the election of the Pope. Even Gregory VII. himself awaited the confirmation of his election from Germany, saying, as Alzog tells us: "I have indeed been elected by the people, but against my own will. I would not, however, allow myself to be forced to take Priest's Orders until my election should have been ratified by the King and the Princes of Germany." This is the last time, however, that the election of a Pope was ratified by an Emperor, for Pope Nicholas II. in 1059, just a little before the election of Gregory VII. had published a decree which restored the right of election to the Romans, but with a most important change. "The Cardinal Bishops," says Hallam, ("seven in number, holding sees in the neighborhood of Rome, and consequently suffragans of the Pope as Patriarch or Metropolitan), were to choose the Supreme Pontiff, with the concurrence first of the Cardinal Priests and Deacons (or Ministers of the Parish

Churches of Rome) and after wards of the laity. * * * It was intended as far as possible to prepare the way for an absolute emancipation of the Papacy from the Imperial control." This decree, which had been inspired by Gregory VII., who had been the principal adviser of Nicholas II. was soon followed by the great struggle between Gregory VII. and Henry IV. regarding the claim of the latter to the appointment of Bishops.

3. The Cathedral Chapters.

The great triumph of the Pope restored much of her ancient freedom to the Church in Episcopal appointments; but the state of the Church, consequent on centuries of ecclesiastical usurpations on the part of the State, rendered it difficult if not impossible, as I have already remarked, to take full advantage of the liberty thus restored. The influence of Bishops who had been obtruded upon the dioceses, and who were more fitted for the court or the field of battle than the spiritual care of souls, had lowered the moral and the intellectual standard of the Clergy.

The condition of Priests and people, combined with the desire of the ruling classes to retain as much as possible of their old hold on Episcopal appointments, is responsible in a great measure for the increased influence which the Cathedral Chapters now began to exert in the election of Bishops. The Chapter consisted of the Priests who were attached to the Cathedral, and who formed the Council of the Bishop. The election by the Chapter was to a certain extent a compromise between the strict law of the Church and the secular power; in fact it may be considered a mere continuation of the secular power in another form, *for the rich revenues attached to the office of Canon or member of the Chapter was such a tempting bait for the noble families, that none but men of distinguished birth were allowed to become members of the Cathedral Chapters.* The influence of the Chapters in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was almost supreme; but even then, when they aimed at engrossing the election of Bishops to the exclusion of all other Priests, we find the Church in the second Council of Lateran 1139 insisting on the right of others than mere Canons or members of the Chapter to be present on the occasion of the nomination of Bishops. In one of the decrees of that Council she pronounces anathema against those Canons who should presume to choose a Bishop without having first summoned other "persons of piety" to be present, or who should dare to exclude such persons from

the election when present. By using the words "persons of piety" the Church meant, as the interpreter of the mind of the Council tells us, other Priests who had the real interests of the Church at heart, and whose zeal for the election was not the mere personal interest which they felt in the promotion of this or that family. This shows the real animus of the Church; for though the necessities of the times, whether moral or political, constrained her to *limit the active power of election to a few Priests*, she still retained the old principle of requiring others to be witnesses of the exercise of that power. It is to be sincerely hoped that a change in our present form of electing Bishops in the United States will not consist merely in giving the few members of a Chapter a voice. This would, indeed be a very sorry representation of the great masses of the Priests, and would only serve to irritate them.

The facility with which the temporal rulers manipulated and controlled the Chapters, not only of the great Metropolitan Churches, but even those of ordinary jurisdiction, left them little cause to regret the triumphs which Gregory VII., Pascal II., Innocent III., and other Popes had gained for the liberty of Episcopal elections. The extraordinary concessions of later Popes, and especially of Leo X. to Francis I. of France in 1517, of Adrian VI. to Charles V. of Spain, and of Pius VII. to Napoleon, in the present century, left little power to the Chapters and made the secular power once more almost supreme in the nomination of Bishops.

It must, however, be borne in mind that, in all these concessions, whether the result of violence or otherwise, the Church only yielded when she saw that her refusal might entail greater loss of souls. To save souls she adapts her laws to the necessities of every age and every nation. Whether she gave to particular persons, or to particular nations, a limited or a complete control over the nomination of her Bishops, she always did so with the view of more effectually accomplishing her divine mission; and she never failed to remind those individuals and nations that the concessions were exceptions to her normal law, by which the Church, and the Church alone, had the power of selecting her own officers. The Church has never lost sight of this in her Councils; and when her hands were free she has always shown her preference for that ancient and Apostolic system which gives the Priests a most important influence in the nomination of her rulers.

CHAPTER II.

How the Church always Labored to Maintain the Right of Priests in the Election for Bishops, and the Kind of Men she Recommended for Election.

From general remarks, however, let us come to particular ones, and see how the Church, when free, always allowed the Priests a say in the election of Bishops. In the original pamphlet I did not cite a single proof from history, for the reason that I was addressing Priests, as I am now, and I knew that their familiarity with the history of the Church rendered it unnecessary for me to enter into details. Besides, I was addressing American Priests, and I employed the arguments taken from the practical and pressing wants of the Church here. As some of the Priests may not have paid special attention to the question of nominating Bishops, or may have forgotten many of the facts in connection with this subject, I will recall some facts which will not only confirm what I have already said, but will also show that men were selected for the Episcopacy, not alone by reason of their moral and intellectual excellence, but because they were well known to the people over whom they were to rule, and had their confidence and affection. They will also show that it was a thing unknown in the early ages of the Church, and condemned by the Popes when first attempted, to send men from distant or obscure places, no matter what their other qualifications, to govern Priests and people who had had no voice in the election.

No one, of course, will accuse me of attempting to claim for the Priests any power *essential* to the making or consecrating of Bishops. This belongs to the Episcopacy alone, and it is a right which the Church can not give to any power, since it belongs to her essentially. However, the Priests claim a real power, or *privilege*, if you may choose to call it so, given them by the Church herself. The State enjoyed a *right* in the nominations; but it was not a right which naturally belonged to the State. The State was given the power, because it forced the Church to

grant it, as a lesser evil; the Priests, as Priests, received it, not through any political necessity, but by divine concession. This *moral* though not *essential right* of the Priests the Church may suspend, as she has done from time to time, but when free, she has always given her Priests permission to exercise it.

We see a most striking proof of this in the very days of the Apostles. Then, the Apostles had certainly the absolute power of appointing Bishops. Did they always insist on exercising that power? Let us see the conduct of Peter himself in the choice of a successor to Judas. Read the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and you will find that Peter called upon the brethren to select a proper person. "In those days," says the Scripture, "Peter rising up in the midst of the brethren, said (now the number of persons was about one hundred and twenty-) * * * * * Wherefore, of these men who have accompanied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day wherein he was taken up from us, one of these must be made in witness with us of his resurrection. And they appointed two, Joseph, called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias." Now the giving of the power by Peter himself to *a hundred and twenty persons, who, certainly were not all Bishops*, shows how early the head of the Church sought the men who had the confidence of the flock.

In the very first century Pope St. Clement tells us that the Bishops should be elected by the "Universal Church"—"*Comprobante universa ecclesia.*" St. Cyprian in the third century says the same thing, and tells us that it is according to "divine tradition and Apostolic law": "*Quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur.*"

In the Sixth Canon of the Council of Nice, held in 325, we are told that the Bishops should be elected in accordance with the Canons of the Church.

Pope Julius I., in referring to Gregory, who had been consecrated and forced upon the people of Alexandria by the influence of the Imperial Court, calls him an *intruder*, and among other reasons he gives for calling him an *intruder*, he mentions the fact that this Bishop Gregory had never been asked for by the Priests, and that he was comparatively unknown to the people: "*Quia nec multis notus, nec a presbyteris, nec ab episcopis, nec a populo postulatus fue-*

rat." This is another proof of what the Church requires, that the Bishop should not be taken from some obscure corner, that he should know and be known to his flock—the shepherd should know his sheep and the sheep should know their shepherd.

Listen to what the great St. Athanasius says on the freedom of Episcopal elections, in speaking of Constantine the Great, who seemed to forget that his jurisdiction did not extend to God's Church, and assumed powers which he afterwards relinquished at the command of the Pope: "He, *seeking to alter the laws—to dissolve the Constitution of our Lord transmitted to us by the Apostles, and to change the customs of the Church, invented a new way of appointing Bishops! He sent them to an unwilling people from strange regions, even fifty days' journey off.*"

Alzog in his History of the Church, Vol. 1, p. 275, speaking of the nominations of Bishops during the first three centuries says: "The election of Bishops, as became the importance of so great a dignity, was surrounded with circumstances of great formality and jealous precaution, and we may add only those of advanced age, of proved virtue—ascetics and confessors of tried courage having been usually preferred—were selected to fill so responsible an office. They received their appointment conformable to the example of the Apostles in the case of Matthias, through the suffrages of the Clergy of the Episcopal City, which however required the concurrence of the provincial Bishops and the consent of the people."

We have seen the testimony of Pope Celestine I. that no Bishop should be placed over people against their will: "*Nullus invitis detur Episcopus.*" Innocent I. in 417, in his letter to the Synod of Toledo, Spain, says it is against the discipline of the Church, to send Bishops from obscure places to rule over people who did not want them: "*Qui contra populi voluntatem et disciplinæ rationem Episcopum locis abditis ordinaverat.*" Ep. III., c. 2.

The history of the Church is full of these instances. Let us, however, cite the testimony of Leo the Great, who ruled from 440 to 461: "On *no account should those be numbered among the Bishops who have not been chosen by the Priests*, and asked for by the people, nor consecrated by the Bishops of the province, with the approbation of the metropolitan."—"*Nulla ratio sinit, ut inter episcopos habeantur, qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebe expetiti, nec a provincialibus cum metropolitani judicio consecrati.*" The

same Pope in the same letter uses these most remarkable words: "*When there is question of electing the Chief Priest, let him be preferred above all others who is required by consent of both Clergy and people; and if the votes should be equal, let the Metropolitan prefer him who has obtained most affection, and is a man of greater merit; only give heed that none shall be chosen who are not wished or asked for;* lest the people being thwarted should despise and hate their Bishop, or lest they should become less religious than is fitting, not having obtained him they desired." These are the words of one of the greatest of the Popes and one of the greatest of the Saints, and they are the very essence of what I said on Episcopal elections in the pamphlet. And yet, strange to say it, is not considered by some, who are neither Popes nor canonized saints, a proper or a wise thing to advocate such sentiments to-day! *Tempora mutantur!* They are the very sentiments that should be taught to-day, and it is the absence of that same principle in the election of Bishops—at least in regard to the share the Clergy should have in elections—that creates that lamentable state of things against which the Pope wished to guard the Church. In repeating what the great Saint taught, we are not introducing revolutionary principles into the Church, we are not trying to Americanize the Church by advancing democratic demands on the part of the Priests, hitherto unheard of, and that would tend to destroy the Church of America. No, but we are advocating what we believe before God is the wisest system for the Church in this country, and the only one that can maintain a firm union of Bishops, Clergy and Laity, and place the Church fairly before the American people, by giving it that representative character which every interest of this country demands, and which is in no way opposed to the general laws of the Church.

It is unnecessary to enter further into proof of this matter, for history is full of such proof. The Church has always favored the giving of this power to her Priests, but the State, for reasons assigned, has always opposed it. There is no State to oppose it in this country; hence we should exercise it. Shutting out Priests, as well as people, from any share in such elections, is not the common law nor the traditional practice of the Church; and there is no valid reason why such a practice should be continued in the United States.

CHAPTER III.

The Condition of the Church in Countries where the Clergy have been Deprived of their Rights, a Warning to the Catholics of the United States.

Some persons may say that the condition of the Church in Europe and in South America as well as in the United States, is in direct contradiction of my thesis, since the evils of which I complain exist only *where the priests actually have a voice in the election*, as in Europe and South America, *but they do not exist at all in the United States, where the priests possess no say in the election.* What I have already said regarding the *merely nominal* power of the Chapters is sufficient answer to what is said of other lands; and as to the United States, the growth of the Church has not been *in consequence of our present defective system, but in spite of it.*

It was the results of the old hold of the State on the appointment of her Bishops that caused me to lament what I saw with my own eyes when lately in Europe, and to say many things in the pamphlet, perhaps to the scandal of some persons, who are totally ignorant of the real condition of the Church there. What I said was true, though not at all flattering to the zeal of the clergy of Italy and Spain as manifested in the religious training of their people who are now flocking to this free country. The clergy of those lands are not at all aware of the mortification the Catholics of the United States experience when, notwithstanding all their efforts to defend the Catholics of Italy and Spain from the attacks of infidels and heretics, they are compelled to acknowledge, in the sad spiritual condition of those who come here, a want of zeal in those who are responsible for their religious training.

Did I write in a spirit of hostility to the Italians? God forbid. I have spent many a day within the past few years (not an easy task for a man that is now not far from fifty years of age and much occupied with the cares of a large parish) in studying their language solely with the view of benefiting the four hundred Italians that are in my own parish. I have even applied for an Italian *priest who is willing to devote himself solely to the care of his own countrymen—a very difficult thing to find.*

We have, of course, many very zealous Italian priests among us, especially those who came here many years ago, but we need more of this class for the tens of thousands of Italians that are coming here. Last year there landed twenty-six thousand Italians at the port of New York City alone. Why do not some of the numerous Monsignori *who have been honored for their great zeal for the Church come here and help us to save their own flesh and blood that are actually perishing for want of spiritual food?* No adequate provision is made for the great Italian immigration. With proper care at home and in this country, there is no race that could give us more real help in the great battle that the Church is waging against infidelity than this same most intellectual Italian race. Why could not the labors of the Italian clergy in this country be confined to their own countrymen, since they so sorely need religious care? Are they not worthy of care? The English-speaking people do not need Italian priests at all.

I have been always friendly to the poor Italians who are cast upon our shores without friends and without any knowledge of our language. I do feel that more could be done for them by their own priests whose zeal for their *preservation* does not seem at all equal to the zeal of Protestants for their *perversion.*

Read the following extract from the New York *Times* of last year:

"A Mission for the Italians.—The Rev. C. Stauder's Successful Work among his Countrymen.

In the Grace Protestant Episcopal Chapel, yesterday, about 150 Italian children attended the Mission Sabbath-school, superintended by the Rev. C. Stauder, of the Italian Evangelization Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The children were as a rule neat in their appearance, and even to the smallest joined in singing the hymns in their own language to an accompaniment on the organ, arranged from monastic and especially the Gregorian chants. When the school was dismissed about 40 adults organized an Italian branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, its Secretary, Robert R. McBurney, being present for that purpose. Dr. Stauder said that the need of such an organization among his countrymen, the Italians of New York, had long been felt, and that the Rev. Henry. C. Potter, Rector of Grace Church, and others of his congregation, had promised aid and encouragement. Dr. Stauder said he had been engaged in this work in New York City, under the auspices of the Protestant Episco-

pal denomination, for nine years, and that the Italian Evangelization Society, from the time of its inception eight years ago, had accumulated a membership of 700 adults and 300 children. Of these a few were in good circumstances; the others were poor, being mostly laborers, but he did not know of a single case of destitution among them. These people were all born Roman Catholics, but had not practised that religion here. There are, he said, between 50,000 and 60,000 such people in the city, and only one Roman Catholic church."

I do not blame the Clergy so much as the old hold of the State on the Church which has rendered the Clergy less zealous and consequently less influential with the people. I said in the old pamphlet: "It was the power of the State that controlled the appointment of the Bishops. The Bishops could not move without the will of the Civil Power, and the Priests, as well as the people, were totally dependent on the Bishops. The people had hardly any will of their own in political matters, and hence when their power could have saved the Church in those lands, they were unable to use it, and they allowed themselves to be trampled upon by a few desperate men."

Had Clergy and Laity had the same zeal for religion that we have in the United States, such a state of things as we now see in a purely Catholic country would be impossible. We see in Italy a most deliberate attempt made by the so-called Italian Government to make the Church the merest creature of the State. It is the old tyranny of the Civil Power trying to absorb or control the Church. The attempt of the Italian Government is the most shameless that we find in history. Not satisfied with having deprived the Church of all her temporal power, it seeks to rob her of the little property that individuals have given her for special purposes, in order to deprive her of every means of exerting her divine mission. Seeing the vitality of the Church and its own failing strength, it confiscates the property of the Propaganda in order to deprive the Church of the power of resisting its persecution; and in order to force the Church to labor to maintain the same robber-power, it *promises* her the *interest on the property it has stolen from her*. It is perhaps well for the Church that the Government has done this desperate deed, for it reveals to the whole Christian world the hypocrisy of that wicked power, and also the true nature of the terrible persecution that the Church is undergoing in Italy.

If there is any faith left in Catholic Europe, she will manifest it by offering protection to the head of God's Church. It is the Propaganda to-day; it will be to the great works of art

to-morrow; and the next day the Vatican itself, and perhaps the very temple of St. Peter. If such things can take place in what we should consider the most Catholic of nations, are we to be blamed for crying out in time for whatever means is best calculated to keep the people so united to the Church as to make it impossible for demagogues to betray them, or to come between them and the Church? Let us interest the laity in Church matters if we are to rely on them in time of need. I remember reading in 1882 a pastoral letter of one of the Bishops of Southern Italy in which he complained most bitterly of the fact that the laity failed to render adequate help to the Clergy in the great battle in which the Church is now engaged in Italy, leaving, as he expressed it, the army of the Church to consist only of officers (Bishops), and without any soldiers (Laity) at all to do the fighting, and excusing themselves on the plea *that they were not Priests.*

We must encourage that personal interest which American Catholics manifest in Church affairs, and not drive them to indifference in such matters, as we are now doing in many parts of the land, by refusing them a proper share in the management of those very temporalities that their own liberality has placed in our hands.

But let us return. The growth of the Church in Europe and South America is necessarily slow on account of old political systems, but the freedom which she continues to enjoy in this land has caused her to advance like a giant rejoicing in his course. The Church receives full protection from the law here, while she is persecuted in most of the so-called Catholic Countries. The American system is protection to all, but favor to none, a good system under the circumstances, when we consider the great variety of sects that exists here. But though the State in its corporate capacity does not formally recognize the Catholic Church as the religion of the land, still, the American people are most favorably disposed towards her.

Considering the great political influence that this country has exercised, and continues to exercise, over Europe, and the wonderful growth of the Church within its vast territory, we are not calling on our imagination when we say that this is destined to be the great Catholic power of the world, and that its influence may yet compel old worn-out Europe to restore Mother Church her long-lost freedom. The best instincts of the Americans are Catholic. Americans admire the Church when they see her in her native splendor, and apart from the shadows that political complications have cast upon her in other lands. The secret of much of the blame we throw on foreign

Clergy for failing to instruct their people properly, is the fact that those people are great stumbling-blocks to this conversion of the American people, by their want of zeal when they come here. It is unnecessary to say that I do not include the Irish in this class, for they are the mainstay of the Church in this country; the Germans too, are good, and so are the English Catholics; but, as *a general rule*, we find very few *practical* Catholics among the *male* members of the populations that come from Latin Europe. Practical Catholics, especially among the *men*, who can explain the doctrines of the Church to others, are what we need for the conversion of the American people, who are easily attracted to the Church by men whose lives are not a contradiction of their faith. It is no exaggeration to say that most of the *men* who come from that portion of the Catholic world to this country fail to edify us, and are to a great extent undoing our own hard work. It would be no harm to the American Church if such men could be kept out of this country totally.

Every effort should be made to foster the good spirit of America, for she has been most friendly to the Church, and if concessions have been made in past times to countries to satisfy their national prejudices, why should we not even anticipate the wish of the United States by harmonizing the laws of the Church with the instincts of the country, when these instincts are in favor of the Church? We have everything in our favor, and we still hesitate to take advantage of it. *It is so long since people and Priests have been considered in connection with the election of Bishops in other lands, that we hardly feel willing to trust them now. Yet the divine instincts of Rome are ever prompting her to fall back on her old Apostolic law, that cements all branches of the Church firmly together by giving her faithful Clergy the exercise of their ancient privilege.*

She is willing, nay, she is anxious to restore this privilege to-day in the case of the Priests of the United States, *provided it may be done with prudence.* There is no difficulty then, I repeat, on the part of Rome; the only difficulty lies with our own Bishops.

Let us be wise in time; let us have confidence in the Priests, and proper regard for the laity. The condition of the Church on the continent of Europe and in South America, where the voice of Priests and people in Church matters has been stifled, should speak to us as the very warning voice of Heaven. It may be too late, if we fail now to take advantage of the happy state of things in this country. We may call on the Clergy and on the laity to interest themselves in Church matters, as the

Church is now vainly doing in Italy, France and Spain, when perhaps our own legislation may have rendered them either unwilling or unable to do so. The cry for *representation* is heard all over the world: why not hearken to it, when it is in harmony with the fundamental laws of the Church, and when it tends to give us the very men that the Church so lamentably needs, in the wonderful changes that are taking place in the moral world? We want fair play for the Church. I am not inciting to insubordination on the part of Clergy or people, as some weak-minded persons may imagine and proclaim.

No Reason Why the Result of Old European Political Complications Should be Imported into this New Land.

If the state of civilization in Europe of the past, or of South America of to-day, necessitated certain forms of discipline tending to curtail the freedom of the Church and to weaken her influence over her own children by suspending or withholding their right to a voice in the choice of their ecclesiastical superiors, there *is no such state of society here, and there is, consequently, no reason for submitting to its effects. We have good reason, then, for objecting to that form of government, and for demanding one that is more in keeping with the freedom of the Church and the freedom of our own country.* Our present form of government is, as all agree, only *temporary*; now, if a change is to be made, we want the *permanent* form to favor the normal law of the Church, which gives the Priests a *substantial say* in Church affairs. The Priests in America *without* the aid of the State, have made a new order of things, or rather, they have brought things back to their old status, when Bishops, Priests and Laity were animated by one spirit—the spiritual good of the Church. They should have a voice in Church matters, and their earnestness in this is only a proof of their zeal for the glory of the Church. It would be a sad day for the Church when the Priests and the Laity of the United States should manifest in Church matters the apathy that is witnessed in the lands referred to. *The change we ask is in conformity with the very spirit and laws of the Church, and it is in harmony with the fundamental principles of our own country—representation.* This last argument should not be ignored. The great American Republic *has been in theory and in practice most favorable to the* Catholic Church. Are we *not standing in our own light by hesitating to adopt this principle of representation?*

In the old pamphlet, I used these words: "Those who are

able to see the drift of things in this country know too well that we are beginning to lose, to some extent, our firm hold on the laity, and that *much of the fault must be attributed to ourselves.* Our newspapers and the Clergy themselves are constantly telling us that the children are showing less loyalty to the Church than their parents. We ourselves are sowing the seed, and the harvest must follow.

Give us, however, large-minded men who are capable of seeing and controlling those causes, and the danger to the Church will soon be diminished.

If persecution comes to the Church in this country *we shall never have to blame the American people; it will begin, as it has already begun* in Italy, France and Spain, *among the children* of the Church.

There is no other country in the world where the masses of the people have more reverence for religion, or where the non-Catholic and educated classes are so favorably disposed toward the Catholic Church, than in the United States. If *we fail in this country, we deserve to fail, for a fairer field, and on so grand a scale, has never been opened to the* Church from *the foundation of* Christianity.

Is the Church equal to the task? Of this there can be no doubt. The Church, however, must get fair play from her own children. She must be allowed to exert all her divine power if she is to gather its millions into her fold and to atone for the losses she is sustaining in the once great Catholic countris of Europe.

There is no question of the real loyalty of the laity of this country to Rome. They are the very Ultramontanes of the Ultramontanes, but they have a business-like way of doing things, and they want to see things done in a business-like manner. They want the best means to the end. It is a healthy sign of the growth of the Church in this land to see the laity taking an intense interest in the appointment of our Bishops. What a contrast to the laity of other lands, that treat the affairs of the Church with cold indifference, and where the Bishops *consider themselves fortunate if they are allowed to appear in public without being insulted.*

CHAPTER IV.

Objections Against Giving this Power to the Clergy.—Is Rome in Favor of Granting It? If she Wants to Know the Needs of the Country, Why Does she not Send A Delegate?

Rome is certainly in favor of giving the Clergy a say in the election of Bishops; there is no doubt on this point. In 1870, when the American Bishops were in Rome, this very question of giving the Clergy a share in the election of the Bishops was proposed to them by the Propaganda. Archbishop Spaulding was then at the head of the American Hierarchy, being in the See of Baltimore, and, in consequence of his having often written to the Propaganda while merely Bishop of Louisville, *urging it to give the Clergy a voice in the elections*, the Propaganda thought as Archbishop of Baltimore he would influence the other Bishops of the country in favor of the Clergy; but strange to say, *he himself voted against it.* This was enough to discourage Rome.

It is an easy matter to show why Rome does not wish to take any independent action in American affairs as long as there is hope that the local authorities may be induced to effect the change. Rome is proverbially slow because she is very wise. The question with her is not, whether the Priests have a right to vote in the election of Bishops, but whether the time has come for the exercise of this right. She must be satisfied as to the steady normal growth of the Church in a country before she applies her permanent laws. The progress of the Church with us has been as great a surprise to the religious world as the growth of the Republic itself has been to the political world; and it has taken even Rome herself somewhat by surprise. Hence, Rome is waiting to see whether our growth is natural, or the result of some accidental cause that soon must cease.

Why Does she not Send Persons Here to Ascertain the True State of the Country?

The United States, politically and religiously, are a mystery to foreigners. It is morally impossible for Europeans to

understand this country unless they reside here for some years and speak the language. A Representative from Rome *would find it impossible to form a correct idea of the condition of the Church here without a perfect knowledge of the language. He would be at the mercy of his own countrymen, whose knowledge of our language, as well as of our country, is necessarily very limited. He would be much astonished, if, indeed, not much scandalized, according to his European notions, to hear Priests and people talking with a freedom regarding the affairs of the Church that is unknown, and that would not be tolerated in Latin Europe; and, yet, he would be equally astonished and edified to find that this very freedom was the result of pure love for the Church, and that it came from men who were willing to suffer even martyrdom for the faith.* In this country, all classes take a personal interest in Church affairs; not so, however, in Europe.

We heard much of late about the coming of a Papal Delegate, and we were making up our minds to give him a right royal welcome, when, lo! we were informed that Rome had changed her mind! Some weighty reasons must certainly have operated to cause Rome to waver in her resolution. On her part, the only reason was her anxiety to do what was best and most pleasing to this country. The change was certainly made to meet the wishes of the American Archbishops then in Rome, who were of the opinion that the Church in this country is sufficiently developed to legislate for its own practical wants. This *action of the Archbishops seems to strengthen the demands of the Clergy, who claim that the Church in this country is so fully developed as to warrant the introduction of Canon Law.*

It was mere newspaper talk to say that there were any "national reasons" against the coming of a Papal Delegate to this country. There are no "national reasons" against his coming, any more than there are such reasons against Archbishop Gibbons acting as Papal Representative at the opening of the projected Council in Baltimore. Not alone the Catholics, but all donominations, would welcome a Papal Delegate to our shores.

The Church is not what she was thirty years ago, when Archbishop Bedini came here; nor does the same blind prejudice exist against her. She is to-day a great moral power; yes, I may say, the greatest moral power in the land; and her influence is not only felt but respected by the American people of all religious denominations. The very sects that thirty years ago were most bitterly opposed to her, and that

laughed at and despised her so-called pretensions, are to-day loud in their praises of her; and some of their leading men regard her as the only *consistent* Christian Church, and advise their disheartened followers to range themselves under her banner in the great battle against infidelity and immorality. The few that hate the Church to-day must fear her. There are no "*national reasons*," then, on the part of friends or foes, against the coming of a Papal Envoy.

But, perhaps, it was intended to send a Delegate, in the capacity of Nuncio, to the Government at Washington, as a mere Civil Representative, or Politico-religious Representative of the Pope? No such thing was thought of. He was simply to come in a purely religious capacity, to preside over the council, to examine into the general condition of the Church, and to settle such matters as now claim the special attention of the Propaganda. There certainly were no national reasons against the coming of such an one.

The *will* of the Archbishops was the only "national reasons" that existed, or that is likely to exist against the coming of a Papal Delegate. Our Bishops are certainly in favor of Home Rule, and Rome shows that she is most willing to grant it. The action of our Bishops at Rome, in this regard, was very *decisive*, and I may say even somewhat startling, to the Clergy of this country, as it certainly must have been in a much greater degree to the authorities at Rome. I twas, however, the proper and honest action for the Church in this country, and Rome recognized it as such. Home Rule and Rome Rule, is what the Church in this country need; but we must not push Home Rule too far. We must encourage Rome to come here in order to see the land with her own eyes. There *is one thing we must not forget in connection with the coming of a Delegate to this country, when an effort is about to be made to bring the Church of this land into harmony with the strict discipline of the* Universal Church: that his presence could in no manner *add to the supreme power which our Bishops already possess*, but that it might materially *add to the power of the Clergy*. Whether this idea has anything to do with the so-called "national reasons" against the coming of a Delegate, at least in the minds of some few members of the Episcopacy, I would not venture to assert.

The firm attitude of the Archbishops with regard to American affairs, and which has been sanctioned by Rome, forms a precedent for the American Clergy, whose equally earnest request to be allowed their full canonical share in the same Home Rule is only a proof of their enlightened zeal for the

greater welfare of the Church. If we are very much in earnest in calling the attention of Rome and of our own Bishops to this point, we do not feel that our action should create much surprise, for if the authorities at Rome leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Bishops, it is to be feared that they will manifest little inclination to share their power with the Priests. If the Propaganda were thoroughly acquainted with the real state of the Church in the United States, it *might give at one day's notice, the power asked by the Priests, and the Bishops of the country would not make the slightest objection.*

Rome still thinks that the body of Bishops in this country have somewhat the politico-religious influence that the Bishops have, or that they formerly had, in old Catholic countries where the State controlled the nominations, and where, consequently, the power of the State was in part represented by the Bishops. Hence she is afraid that any independent action of hers with regard to the nominating of Bishops, or any other very important measure, *might create dissatisfaction in all ranks of* the American Church *from the sole fact of its failing to find favor with the Episcopacy.* This *misunderstanding* of the real influence of the Clergy and people in this country gives our Bishops a wonderful power at Rome, where the Bishops are regarded, as they should be, as the full expression of the will of Clergy and Laity. This should be so, and would be so, *de facto* as well as *de jure*, in all respects, if the Bishops were chosen by the Clergy. But perhaps I am going too far. I am only, however, giving a reason for the fact that Rome hesitates to take *independent action* in the matter of allowing the Priests of this country a share in the election of Bishops, though she is undoubtedly in favor of their exercising it.

The coming of a Delegate *who could speak our language*, would have much influence in removing this misunderstanding and obtaining proper recognition for the great part which belongs to the Clergy in the affairs of the American Church. It may not be out of place to quote what I said in the old pamphlet on this point.

"*As things are in this country, all the Bishops united, but apart from the Priests and the people, who with us are a unit, could not cause Rome any annoyance, even if so inclined for any measure, no matter how much opposed to their will, that Rome should think proper to enforce. The only sources from which any trouble can arise are the Priests and the people, who hold towards the Bishops in this country, at least in a finan-*

cial point of view, somewhat the relation that the civil power holds towards them in Europe. Here the Bishops depend upon the voluntary offerings of the people and upon the personal efforts of the Priests, whose zeal may increase or diminish those offerings at will. The person on whom the growth of the Church in this country depends mainly, is the Priest. I am simply stating the condition of things in the United States. There is not, as far as I am aware, the same state of things in any other country. This exceptional state of things is hardly understood outside of this country, and if Rome were thoroughly aware of it, there would be one great step made towards securing the power of nominating the Bishops for the Priests."

It is the Clergy that have actually made the Church what she is in the United States, and strange to say, they have no more to say in legislating for the interests of the same Church than the inhabitants of South Africa. THEIR ZEAL GATHERS UP THE FUNDS THAT BRING CONSOLATION TO THE HEART OF THE Holy Father in the midst of his own ungrateful countrymen, and yet the mere Priests have hardly any channel of communication open between them and the Propaganda. Their voice cannot make itself heard. As we have no Papal Representative here to whom we could open our minds without reserve, were it not wise to give us some means, some easy and trustworthy means, of giving expression to our wants? The absence of a Delegate, and the absence of any and every American or even English speaking person, in and around the Propaganda, cuts the American Clergy off practically from all direct communication with Rome.

It is strange that the English language has not more attractions for some of those ecclesiastics that could use it to such advantage for the Church of this land. What a godsend it would be to some of our American Priests, who may not talk Italian or French, or only imperfectly, to find, even among the assistant clerks in the Propaganda, one or two persons to whom they could write, or with whom they might freely converse in explanation of matters that perhaps had necessitated their traveling so many thousand miles from home. Looking at things, as I thought, *practically*, but as others may judge, *impertinently*, I wondered why a few of our American College young men could not be retained even as assistant-clerks in the Propaganda, after their ordination. It would certainly be a great convenience to American Priests, and they would fully appreciate this favor on the part of the Propaganda, which would gain much more than the trifling expense of a mere

nominal salary of a few young men. The person should be an American who speaks Italian, but *not* an Italian who speaks English. It would do more good in another direction; it would certainly put an end to that matter to which I referred in the old pamphlet, and for which *one or two persons* in the United States, and not in Rome, *are totally responsible.* The words I used were these: "Notwithstanding all our extraordinary growth, notwithstanding all our extraordinary resources, and notwithstanding our oft-repeated determination to bring the Church of this country under strict ecclesiastical discipline; notwithstanding all this, the Laity and the Priests, and the very Bishops themselves, of the great American Church *have to depend upon the enterprise of a pious lady convert at Rome for the first authentic information of the appointment of the Bishops for this country.*"

We do not blame the lady; but we are certainly inclined to find fault with those one or two prelates *without whose influence* a *female could never have obtained such recognition, and but for whose influence,* at *least, one* English-speaking *ecclesiastic would have been* assistant-clerk at the Propaganda. It is *surpassing strange that some of our* Americans *who are devoutly scrupulous and punctilious in matters purely ecclesiastical, should not be more anxious than they are in confiding ecclesiastical matters* to *ecclesiastical persons!!!* The matter to which I now call attention has occasioned much unfavorable comment in all ranks of the Church in this country, among Laity and Clergy, and even among the Bishops; AND IT SHOULD BE STOPPED AT ONCE. "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis tempus eget."

I am not ignorant of the great importance of this matter or of the great delicacy of touching it; but as long as those who are responsible for it fail to see it in its proper light, we are justified in calling the attention of Rome to it; and Rome will put a stop to it. The blame is on the American side, and we must all feel annoyed that blame should be attached to any one, and especially to those whose influence is by no means insignificant, and who may be a most demonstrative element in the coming Council, since they are firmly opposed to giving any share in Episcopal elections to the Priests. Those persons should remember that the Priests are the proper persons to be relied on in all ecclesiastical matters; and that by employing other channels they are not only injuring themselves personally, but also the Church.

Rome *will give us all the fair-play we want, but Rome must get fair-play for herself.* She is anxious to ascertain the true

state of the Church in this Great Republic; *let us tell it to her ourselves, and not permit a small clique of a few individuals,* or *even* a *pious lady,* to *do all the talking for us.*

It is a great pity that some of the great men of Rome, and especially of those who have control of the affairs of the American Church, do not come here even in an *unofficial capacity,* in order to learn what Rome is so anxious to know. A few years' travel of such men would do infinite good. There is no doubt but the warmest and most enthusiastic welcome would be given them in all sections of the Great Republic. Is it not worth trying? Let one of Rome's greatest men come here, such as Cardinal Parocchi, who has so many extraordinary qualities to render his visit a great blessing to the United States. Rome's most loyal children will give him as warm a welcome here as any Prince of the Church has ever received in Catholic lands; and perhaps in after years they may congratulate themselves on having seen at least one Pope whose presence had honored the Great Republic. The great gain to the American Church and to Rome herself would well repay the inconvenience of such a visit. Let us see more of Rome, and let Rome see more of us *with her own eyes.*

CHAPTER V.

OBJECTIONS CONTINUED.

THE BISHOPS ARE THE ONLY PERSONS QUALIFIED TO ADVISE ROME ON THIS POINT; AND THE BISHOPS ARE OPPOSED TO THE GIVING OF THIS POWER. THE CLERGY ARE NOT ALL IN FAVOR OF IT. MANY OTHER OBJECTIONS MADE AND ANSWERED.

I was saying that Rome must know the condition of the country before making any serious changes. The question naturally arises here: Who are to give Rome the proper information? Some, of course, will say that the information must come from the Bishops, and from them alone, and that if they are opposed to the change, this should end all discussion of the matter by Priests or by anybody else.

We must remember, however, that we are not discussing an article of faith, and that where mere judgment and practical experience and love for the Church are required, the united voices of the Clergy and Laity and of many among the Bishops must have great weight. There is no doubt but the voice of the laity is entirely in our favor; and the people whose goodwill has always been sought in the appointment of Bishops should have this concession granted them.

In this country, where the interests of Priests and people have been so identical, the people are willing to leave their choice to the judgment of the Priests. In giving the Priests the power asked, you give the people all they desire in the United States. While granting, then, the great force of the negative voice of, say, most of the Bishops, for mere argument's sake, *the united voices of so many others are certainly sufficient to make them reflect seriously on the prudence of withholding a right which nothing but extraordinary reasons will justify.*

It is human nature, and we all share it to a great extent, no matter how high we climb the ladder of perfection, *to part reluctantly, or, at least, very slowly, with power, and especially when long possessed.* It may, of course, be alleged that it is equally human to desire power, and hence, that the Clergy are in favor of obtaining a voice in the election of

their Bishops. There is, however, this difference, that one side is withholding what belongs to the other, and that the Clergy are only asking what is their right and what is guaranteed them by the laws of the Church. If mere weight of judgment be taken, I think the verdict is in favor of granting this power to the Priests. for we must not forget that the judgment of the Bishops in this matter is simply the judgment of persons who a few years ago were themselves mere Priests.

Would All the Priests Favor the Change?

I do not presume to say that every Priest would favor it, for this would be morally impossible, considering that *many of them have lately come from other lands, where such a power does not exist, and where political considerations render it impossible for many years to come.* There is no doubt, however, but a vast majority would vote for it. All those of the country, or ordained for the country, or who have become identified with the country from long residence, are in favor of it. There is no doubt but some of our so-called American Priests would object to such a change. I mean Priests who call themselves Americans, but who are only a short time in the country, and whose conduct as reported at Rome forms one of the greatest obstacles against entrusting the American Priests with the power of electing the Bishops. It is strange that many of our Bishops manifest partiality for such men; perhaps on account of obtaining them already ordained without expense to the Diocese. If the matter were thoroughly examined, it would be found that most of the real complaints against the fitness of American Priests come from these very source. These men would not only oppose any measure tending to establish strict law, but it would be a very easy matter to induce them to send a petition to the Council at Baltimore protesting against giving the power of Episcopal nominations to the Clergy. Keep this class of men at a distance, and the American Priests will enjoy a better reputation at Rome. We have to bear the sins of others.

The Church is not Sufficiently Developed in this Country to Justify such a Change.

There may be a few exceptional places in the Far West or Southwest where the temporary or missionary law may still be left in force; but there is no other part of the world where the Church is in a more flourishing condition than in the

United States. To us in this country, and especially to those of us who know how matters are elsewhere, it seems preposterous to attempt to prove this proposition. If we are to count only *practical* Catholics, New York City is the most Catholic city in the world. Philadelphia and Brooklyn in this respect will compare with the greatest cities of Continental Europe. *There are more Catholics in the City of New York than there are inhabitants in any city of Italy.*

What do we lack? Absolutely nothing. We have the faith, the zeal and the firm attachment to the See of Peter that are not surpassed, and that are hardly equaled, by any other Church of Christendom. Churches and other manifestations of religion abound, and are arising daily as if by miracle. And yet, forsooth, we are not fully developed to justify the establishing of the regular law of the Church!!! No; we must submit to the old missionary and un-American system, against which the old pioneer Priests protested—a system good enough, perhaps, a hundred years ago, when Priests were very few and when congregations were mainly composed of the half-savage Indians of the forests; but entirely inadequate to our growth of to-day.

But will not the Granting of such a Power Tend to Excite too much Ambition among the Priests?

Granting, for argument's sake, that a few of our city Pastors take it into their heads to spend a little extra time in dispensing *hospitality* to their fellow-Priests from the country, with the double view, if you will, of showing that they possess the ordinary virtues of a Priest, and, a least, one of those required of a Bishop, such ambition will harm no one. Should our city Pastors, however, presume too much on the verdancy of their country guests, they are more likely to become the laughing-stocks, than the Bishops of the country. The plan of voting by the Priests renders mere *individual diplomacy* of no avail. The best man in this case has the best chance. Besides, the Bishops may retain the veto power, and thus render any such ambition ineffective.

Not so, however, with our present system, which makes it possible to awaken ambition that may destroy the best qualities of men, otherwise most worthy, by involving them in a career of diplomacy that banishes for ever the filial love and reverence that should alway attach to the spiritual head of the Diocese. The new plan, as I have said, makes it morally im-

possible for the choice to depend virtually on one or two persons, who, years in anticipation of the events, inform a certain person of their intention of elevating him to a certain position, and who, having secured his own active co-operation towards his own election, are responsible for a course of action, rendered necessary, indeed, for the success of their mutual scheme, but hardly pardonable in secular politics, and certainly most contemptible in the eyes of God's Church. With our present plan this is possible; with the one suggested, it is not.

New Titles.

The Priests ask this power, not through ambition, but solely for the benefit of the Church. Anything that tends to create unworthy ambition among the Priests should meet with no encouragement from any side. And for this reason it is with real pain that we see an attempt made to introduce among us, of late, titles and distinctions hitherto unknown, and certainly without apparent usefulness to the Church of this country, and calculated more than anything else to lay the foundation of that same foolish and silly ambition so much apprehended. It is a question whether such dignities have done any real good to the Church even in aristocratic lands where they are so numerous; and it is more than questionable whether they will benefit the Church in this republican country, where such honors, at least at the present time, are more likely to create a smile at the expense of their possessors than to awaken reverence among their fellow-Priests.

Rome is not over-anxious to confer such honors on Priests of this country unless asked to do so. No Priest of the United States has ever asked for those distinctions, and it is little less than a strain on his humility to accept them when informed by his Bishop that he has asked and obtained them for him. The Americans are most practical people, and they wish to see the *cui-bono* of all things. It seems to them that such honors are likely to injure the old Apostolic and democratic spirit of the American Priesthood.

We do not covet honors, nor do we grudge the highest honors that the Church can confer upon our really distinguished men, but we cannot view with indifference the introduction of distinctions that must, as a matter of course, extend to many whom we may not regard as deserving of them as ourselves. Such honors are practically calculated to compel us to feel an inferiority, without any corresponding benefit to the Church. The greatest blessing a Church can have is a

high-toned, self-respecting clergy. We have this. Why, then, attempt to introduce *castes* among us? Who are responsible for this? If Rome really understands that the Bishops, the Clergy, and even the Laity, are unanimously opposed to the necessity or the utility of introducing here what the Priests consider a most odious and invidious distinction, she will soon put a stop to it.

We are proud of true mental ability, and hence we honor those men who have gained a D. D. in a public contest. These are the only *titled* men that we need, and the real Monsignori of the Church in this land.

The typical American Priest is neither selfish nor ambitious, but he is unwilling to be forced to acknowledge an inferiority for which there is no "raison d'etre" "Aut Cæsar, aut nullus," is his motto: "Either a Bishop or a simple Priest." He labors as a very Apostle, never once casting a single thought on the honors and distinctions so well known and so much prized by foreign ecclesiastics. His only real ambition is the hard work of the mission, and as far as the mere worldly distinction is concerned, it makes very little difference to him whether he wears the red hat of the Cardinal or the humble garb of a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. I am aware that this language may be very rude, indeed, according to some, but I know that the sentiments I express are those of the whole country.

The Church needs many things, but she certainly does not need this. Those who are responsible for this new mode of honoring our Priests are hardly doing the wise thing for the Church; and it is to be hoped that some of our shrewd and *far-seeing fathers of the coming* Council *may give them a polite hint not to ask for any more* Monsignori, at least for a very long time to come.

"Psincipiis obsta, sero medecina paratur,
Cum mala per longas convaluere moras."

Let Well-enough Alone.

This is hardly a Catholic or an American principle. Things are not well-enough for the Church when they are easily susceptible of improvement, and when circumstances render this improvement imperative. Matters are not at all well-enough as they are now. This hardly requires proof for those who see beneath the surface. It would not be prudent or profitable to spread the proofs before the public in a pamphlet. A few of the most glaring needs of the Church have been referred to because they are already too well known.

The Church has Prospered under the Present System, and Hence we should not Change it.

The growth of the Church has not been in *consequence* of our present imperfect form of government, *but in spite of it.* It is the hard-working apostolic Priest under the guidance of the equally hard-working and zealous Bishop that made the Church what she is. The argument that holds the plan is best because the Church has flourished while it was in existence proves too much, since the same reasoning would abolish all Clerical Retreats, all Synods, all Conferences, all Bishops', Councils, and many other *old-fashioned requirements* of the Church, *simply because more than a few of our Bishops get along without them, and their Dioceses are said to be most flourishing.* If, however, matters do flourish (?), or at any rate seem to flourish, *without* those grand old safeguards which the wisdom of mother Church has thrown around the Bishop for his own sake as well as for that of his Priests and his People, is there any reason to suppose that affairs would be *less prosperous if all the appliances of the* Church *were in full operation?* The progress of the Church has not been advanced by neglecting her laws. On the contrary, our present system, as practised by some, and a good number, is a *comparative nightmare on the progress* of the Church. No Clerical Retreats, no Conferences, no advice asked from Council from one end of the year to the other!!! And this is substantially the argument against a change!!

CHAPTER VI.

Other Reasons why the Clergy ask a change.

The system should be changed. It leaves the very Bishops themselves at a great disadvantage. Everything considered the Bishops are doing according to the best of their ability. Some of them, owing to old customs and precedents of the exercise of arbitrary power, which the absence of well-defined law rendered possible, and even pardonable in the past, are tempted to be a canon law to themselves. It was not very long ago that it was humorously said by Pope Pius IX that an American Bishop had more jurisdiction than himself. *The Clergy are in a great measure dependent on the Bishop's interpretation of a loosely defined law, and this is the cause of as much, if not, indeed, more, inconvenience to the Bishop than to the Priest.* I am not at all in sympathy with those who are ever retailing their real or imaginary grievances against Bishops, but who in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred are the authors of their own misfortunes. I would, however, *have the law sharply defined for bishops as well as for Priests.*

It is no easy matter to exercise supreme power with supreme moderation. It is a task that very few men, and especially men who have little experience in the art of governing, as some of our Bishops, are capable of performing. Some are so earnest in applying all the might of the most odious laws, for the greater honor and glory of God, as they firmly believe, that they seem to be totally ignorant of the fact that Priests have any rights at all, save to submit absolutely, and under pain of being regarded as most rebellious subjects, to their harsh interpretation, and harsher application, of cold, formal and ill-defined law. *The spirit of the Church is mildness itself, and a Bishop is expected to govern as a tender father and not as a magistrate who ever holds the rod in terrorem.*

I do not presume to say that the Bishops are unreasonable or unkind to the Priests. Most of the difficulties that arise between them are owing to the badly defined laws that throw all the power into the hands of the Bishops and leave comparatively nothing to the Priests. This is cal-

culated to create a feeling of insecurity and a want of manliness in the Priest to have the hand of absolute power ever raised over his head, though the Church tells the Bishop to be extremely cautious in the exercise of that power. The mere caprice of an excentric person may take advantage of such power and destroy the future of a noble worker in the Church. It is true, we are called "Rectors" and we are told that we can not be moved from our Churches. Well, if I mistake not the Bishop has still the absolute power of changing a Priest from one Church to another against the will of that Priest, though he be a Rector. What is a "Rector" in this country? Nobody knows. We are called "Rectors," but there are no "Rectors," as such, in the United States. What are we then?

Another matter that tells more against the so-called Rector, is *removing his parish from him when the law requires too much formality in removing himself, or when te Priest may be tempted to appeal to Rome even after his removal.* His parish may be easily divided. A religious order may get permission to build a church in part of his parish. The Bishop may, of course, assign fixed limits to the new parish so-called, and besides giving the Holy Fathers full jurisdiction over all classes of Catholics of all nationalities within those limits, *allow them also in virtue of his plenary power to baptize and to marry persons within their neighbor's parish, even when the neighbor can speak the foreign language of those baptized or married, at least, well enough to administer these sacraments; or even when such persons speak English language as fluently as their mother tongue. This gives two Pastors within the same parish, a thing that is new to canon law.* What can the Pastor do? Protest. What more? Nothing, absolutely nothing. I have great respect for the Religious Orders, but I think accepting a parish under such conditions, is injurious to the orders themselves, as well as unjust to the secular Clergy. I would stop such a practice, so contrary to the spirit and the intention of the Church, which wishes every Pastor to have his own sheep and that he should know them and *they should follow* HIS *voice and not that of another.*

The secular Priests are most friendly to their brethren of the Religious Orders *but they want every Pastor to be a pastor over his own flock, to have the limits of his jurisdiction well defined and to be supreme within those limits.*

It is no wonder some of our Female Orders have taken advantage of the example set them and by their *persistent system of begging in all directions, outside their own parishes and outside their own dioceses, against prohibitions of Priests and Bishops, have become the torment and the very terror* of the business men, the bankers and the merchants of our large cities, Catholics as well as Protestants. It is no exaggeration to say that such conduct is a serious injury to those very orders and that it lowers the Church in the eyes of strangers, many of whom are ceasing to wonder that such persons were driven fom other lands.

The very Sisters of Charity that enter the stores in New York City, to make purchases, are mortified when they see themselves shunned by the merchants, and even the employes, who take it for granted that they are begging money. These good Sisters, however, are not of the begging class, but the others trade on the esteem which every one has for the Sisters of Charity. Charity that costs the church so dearly is very questionable.

Can nothing be done by way of controlling those Mendicant orders, male and female, that erect extravagant edifices *without* and even *against* the advice of Priest and Bishop, whenever they have obtained the humblest footing in a diocese, and who then spread themselves over every parish, *rudely cropping whatever is green, and thus depriving ourselves of the voluntary offerings that are necessary for the support of our parish schools? It must be remembered that the secular Priests depend entirely on the voluntary offerings of the laity, having no Church endowments as the secular Clergy have even yet in Italy*, and that, if the spare cash is persistently and systematically drawn from our people to build and maintain edifices that are far less needed than parish schools and orphan asylums, the schools and the asylums must suffer. Our schools, in many places, are now suffering from this evil; our people are suffering from it, and even those charitable people friendly to the Catholic Church, though not of her communion, are pestered by those male and female itinerant collectors or beggars. This has already become a crying abuse; and it is a common thing for male and female "tramps" to go from house to house soliciting money, pretending to be father so-and-so or sister so-and-so from certain well-known monasteries or convents.

CHAPTER VII.

THE KIND OF MEN WE NEED AND HOW TO GET THEM.

This chapter is taken word for word from the old pamphlet:

"The Church in this country has begun to experience troubles—as to the causes and the remedies, I cannot be said to be ignorant. I have already pointed out some of the difficulties experienced in this land; how are we to remedy these and others that we are aware of? The remedy lies in the very power that I ask. It will stand on its own merits without the aid of arguments from the state of the Church in Europe. Our present system of nominating Bishops is a comparative drawback to the growth of the Church here. It aims at giving us the best men, but it does not always succeed. It gives us men of piety, and of learning, but it does not give us men of large experience on the mission, and of large experience among men. This experience is one of the most important qualifications for a Bishop in the United States. In other countries the temporal affairs of the Church depend in a great measure on the civil power, or they have been fixed by former legislation, but in this place the Church is being built, and new developments are presenting themselves from day to day and demanding immediate solution. To meet these, to buy and sell, and exchange property, and to govern a large number of Priests, requires a man of wisdom, of prudence, of experience, and of tact. The mere business qualities so absolutely necessary in this country, are hardly thought of in Europe, where piety and learning suffice to watch over the established order of things. There *is an exceptional state of things in this country that requires this new element*, if I may so call it, in the American Bishop.

Hence, to make a man a Bishop in this country who has never been on his mission, is a cruelty to the man himself, if he feels his inability, and it is also a great injustice to the Church. He may be a great theologian, or a great saint, but he is certainly not qualified to be a Bishop without a thorough acquaintance with the diocese and the Priests of the diocese. It may happen that

a man has piety and learning and still is practically unfit to govern the smallest parish, not to talk of a whole diocese.

We want men who know how to govern, and also who know the country, and the people they are to govern. God has blessed his Church with such men in the past, and we have such men now among us. But there are some who are sadly wanting in these business qualifications. Some one may say: This is speaking disparagingly of our Bishops, and it is very unbecoming in a Priest to do so. It is far from my mind to wish to say the remotest word in dispraise of our great and good Bishops. No man can be blamed for want of experience on the mission; and it is not wrong to say that such experience is necessary for a Bishop in this country. I do not find fault with the Bishops personally, but with the system that fails to give us the best men for the present wants of the Church.

The Best Men and How to Get Them.

The best men are those who have labored long and successfully on the mission, and who have manifested ability in the management of important affairs. Now, the Priests of the mission are the best qualified to choose such men, for they know their fellow-Priests thoroughly. The Bishops are often unable, owing to circumstances, to decide whether certain persons have the requisite qualities, whereas the same persons cannot escape the scrutiny of a hundred or more of their fellow-Priests. I do not say that a young Priest, just from the seminary, should be allowed to decide on the qualifications of a Bishop or the wants of the Church. This power should be confined to the rectors of Churches, even to those rectors who may have been a certain number of years on the mission.

But supposing the power limited to this number, and supposing them to be well qualified for the choice of a Bishop, is it certain that they would nominate the best men? I think they would. But would not the exercise of such a power lead to disorder and scandal? I think not, providing always proper legislation regulates the exercise of this power. But would it not give rise to bitter feelings on the score of nationalities? I think any feelings arising on this account would be much less intense than those that are engendered by our present mode of nominating.

Will it give rise to disorders or scandals! There might be some lack of order were there no laws as to the time, place, and manner of exercising this power. It *is not necessary that the place of meeting should be a hotel*, or that every Priest in the diocese, young or old, should be present at the nominations. Proper safeguards will prevent any disorder. Take, for example, the case of Ireland where the Priests exercise this power; there is not the slightest fear of disorder or of disedification. The voting takes place under the supervision of the Metropolitan in the Cathedral of the deceased Bishop on the occasion of the "Month's Mind." In this meeting, where everything is calculated to inspire them with the gravity and the solemnity of the work before them, none are permitted to vote save the parish Priests. The Bishops of the Province are generally present on account of the "Month's Mind," but whether they are or not, they and the Metropolitan send the three names voted for by the Priests to Rome with their own comments as to the qualifications of each person voted for. They may consider the *dignissimus* of the Priests only *dignus*, or vice versa; or they may advise Rome to reject all the names, and to appoint a person who may have received only one single vote at the meeting of the Priests. This influence of the Bishops has very often succeeded in rendering the choices of the Priests ineffective, and causing much dissatisfaction in many parts of Ireland. This point should not be lost sight of, if we wish the choice of the Priests in this country to be more than a mere nominal one. The best way, perhaps, for us would be to nominate subject to the veto of the Bishops. However, this is only a suggestion.

Will the Rectors Nominate the Best Men?

Are the rectors likely to give us the most pious and the most learned men? Perhaps not; but they will certainly give us men with sufficient piety and learning, and with the prudence and tact so necessary in this new country. The Church can avail herself of all the piety and of all the learning of her children without making them Bishops. A man may be a saint, but a very poor Bishop; he may know how to teach philosophy in a college, but be very poorly fitted for governing Priests on the mission. He may govern, but he will have to be always making laws of his own, or recurring to the most odious laws of

the Church, to enforce the obedience to what he may regard as his most conscientious duty.

The rectors will give us men for whose want of experience we shall not be compelled to apologize to our own people as well as to those outside the Church.

My idea is expressed by an anecdote that is told of St. Bernard, who was asked to vote for a prior of the monastery. Of the first man proposed to him under the plea that he was the most holy in the monastery, he said, "If he be the most holy, let him pray for us;" of another, who was the most learned, he said, "If he be the most learned, let him teach us;" but of the last who was most prudent, he said, "If he be the most prudent man, in the name of God let him govern us." This is the class of men the Church needs. The Priests will give us the best men. The condition of the Priests in this country is different from that of Priests in other lands. Here the Priests themselves have built up the Church and made her the wonder of Christendom. They have done, in a comparatively short time, what it required centuries to do in other countries. Their zeal and their disinterestedness are beyond question; and yet we ask, "Will they take a conscientious interest in giving us the men to rule the churches that are the work of their own hands?". There is not a more hardworking body of Priests in the world than our own. Give them fair play and they will give us the men, who will make short work of our present numerous complaints of insubordination on the part of the Clergy.

Will not Bitter Feelings of Nationalities Arise?

Well, no matter what system is employed there will be more or less of nationality felt, owing to the great variety of nations that are represented here. I consider every Priest an American who has been in the country from his youth and who has been thoroughly identified with the spirit of the country. With this definition of an American, I think any system that forces men of other nationalities upon the country, does a great injury to religion. Our present system is not at all free from this charge. Let there be no question of nationality raised, but if there is, let the Bishop be American. This would indeed be a very strong objection, if it could be urged against the proposed plan. In fact, the very plan we now employ seems to provoke this very question. We fall into a

greater evil by trying to avoid a lesser one, for, in order to avoid the charge of nationality, we appoint in many parts of the country the very men who are totally opposed to the nationality of the majority of the Priests and the people of the diocese, men whose youth, whose early training, whose habits of thought, and, in some cases, whose very language, are foreign to the country. Human nature is human nature, and the Church does not require us to divest ourselves of it altogether; and as long as we live we are inclined to grumble when we think we have cause. We can not blame people or Priests if they labor with less enthusiasm under such Bishops, than under those who understand and sympathize with them.

Defects of our Present System.

What would people in Germany say if some American, with all his Yankee ways, were to be appointed over them, on the plea that there were a large number of Americans in that section of Germany? They would hardly submit with a good grace, for they would think that the Americans might be well attended if a second Vicar General were appointed for their special benefit.

You may say that the Bishop does not depend upon majorities in the discharge of his episcopal functions. He certainly does not; but the best interests of the Church are consulted by keeping people and Clergy united, and a Bishop who has the great majority of Priests and people firmly united with him, may do much good, where the Church depends entirely on the voluntary offerings of the people.

You may say it makes very little difference to a Bishop whether the Priests or the people are satisfied with his appointment. It makes a very great difference to the Church, and this fact is making itself felt very materially in many parts of the country. It is all very well to say that Priests and people should always cheerfully submit to those whom the Church has placed to rule them. This should be so, and would be so, and if it is not always the case, it is in a great measure owing to the system which renders it very difficult. Men are not always chosen who are identified with the country and with the majority of the people who have built up religion and who are still its main support If we have a choice of plans, we should choose the best. The men chosen by the Priests will always have a majority of Priests and people to support them, and no matter what

feelings of nationality may at first be felt, they will soon vanish after the will of the greater number shall have been made known. This is a representative country and we are used to submit without grumbling to the decision of the majority, so that the giving of this power to the Priests will tend to do away with feelings of nationality, and not to increase them. With our present system, we seldom have a respectable minority satisfied; and hence we create these bitter disappointments that militate against the growth of the Church. Our present system *ignores ex professo the will of the Priests*, and makes it even impossible for them to exercise any scrutiny as to the moral or intellectual, or business qualifications of the person into whose hands are to be committed the destinies of the diocese. So strict is the secrecy observed in sending the names to Rome, that the very Priests who have spent themselves in building up the Church cannot obtain a inkling of who is to be their Bishop. But, perhaps they would criticise him too severely if they were to know him, and thus prevent his nomination. I think the man whose character cannot stand a severe criticism is hardly the best man for a Bishop; and I think that it were much better to prevent his nomination by proper representations to Rome than to be sending these representations when it is too late.

It is thought better to stifle all dissatisfaction by announcing the names after the confirmation has taken place, when the fear of giving scandal, and the stringent laws of the Church governing such matters are regarded as proof against unfavorable public comments. This, however, is hardly the wisest plan, for it only intensifies dissatisfaction and causes many of the Priests and the laity to lose heart in their work, on account of charges to insubordination from their spiritual head, whose piety and learning, and good intentions, are outweighed by his want of experience in the management of the great interests which their prudence and liberality have given to the Church.

There are not more law abiding Priests and people in the world than those of the United States. But they want all orders of the Church to abide by law, and it is in the interest of the Church that they are unwilling to see it violated with impunity. The Council of Baltimore in 1866 made very wise laws for the needs of the Church at that time, but many of those laws are no more observed

in many parts of this country than if they were made for the man in the moon. Even many of the restraints placed on the mode of selecting men for bishoprics have to yield to the personal preferences of individuals. This is an abuse that Rome will not sustain, and the person who calls attention to it, is working for the true interests of the Church. It is not at all necessary to give instances, bnt new legislation is necessary to render such abuses impossible.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Remedy. The Coming Council. Concluding Remarks.

What is the remedy for these and many other matters that may not be mentioned in a pamphlet? I think the remedy will come when we get the men who understand thoroughly the real wants of the Church and who can wield all the moral power of the diocese by possessing the confidence of Priests and people. The Church wants such men; and such men she can have by permitting the Priests, or at least a fair representation of them, to make, or to assist the Bishops in making, the selection. The laity, too, have a right to some consideration; and at present they have no say directly or indirectly on such matters, and God knows they deserve it, in this country, at any rate. It is true, they lay no claim to a voice in the election of a Bishop, such as was granted them by the ancient law of the Church from the very days of the Apostles, but they have reason to expect the best men that the ranks of the Clergy can furnish. This is not done, and it is too patent to require proof. Is it not a crime against them, and in some sense high treason against the Church to deny them this? They have a right to those men for whose drawbacks they must not be forced to apologize. The Church has them, and the Church should be free to employ them in the Episcopacy.

The Coming Council.

What have the Clergy to expect from the Council? I must confess I have little hope of obtaining the power we ask unless we take united action, such as that already suggested. The Council will, without doubt, be a great blessing, if *this question is fairly met and solved.* Any attempt to postpone the question, or to give us a mere shadow of power, will only serve to irritate the Clergy and to increase the evil. I am no alarmist. This question is a burning one; and its neglect would be most unwise. *It underlies nearly all the other questions that are pressing for immediate consideration.* Without this change,

others will hardly effect much. There is certainly a grand opportunity, and one that Rome fully sanctions, of healing many wounds and of giving the Church an element of strength that nothing else can secure her. If we want real unity, give the Clergy the power of nominating the rulers of the Church.

Any attempt at postponing the Council, or substituting for it, the mere narrow policy of one particular diocese, and which, perhaps, does not meet the wants of religion even in that particular diocese, would be a misfortune. We want the Plenary Council because we want serious changes in our present temporary form of government; and we need a broad policy to suit all sections of the country. There is no doubt, but some few persons, but very few, and they not at all the eminent members of the Hierarchy, are opposed to a change and consequently to the coming of a Delegate or the coming of a Council.

Let us hope for great things from the Council. And we have good reason to hope for them, for a better selection than Archbishop Gibbons could not have been made, to preside over the Council. He is an apostolic Bishop; and besides his thorough knowledge of the state of the Church in this land, he is heart and soul in sympathy with the Priests. He is, moreover, the ruler of a great diocese whose traditions favor the rights of the Clergy, for it has always paid, at least, some regard to the opinion of its distinguished Priests whenever there was question of selecting names for the Episcopacy.

Concluding Remarks.

Clergy and laity manifest interest, and intense interest too, in church affairs in the United States, a thing which the Church is almost vainly laboring to bring about in many other parts of Christendom, where the results of old political complications still weigh her down. Why should we not labor earnestly to maintain this state of things by giving men to govern the people who thoroughly understand them, and who know how to employ the people to help them govern with glory to the Church? There seems to be no sound reason against this; but in many cases this is not done; and hence the spirit of discontent which is doing its fatal work in many of the most important sections of the country. God forbid that I should attempt to misrepresent or to exaggerate the true state of matters, or that I should wish in any manner to expose unneces-

sarily existing evils. I am laboring honestly, and not at all imprudently, as some silly persons may charge, to remove one of the most potent causes of mischief to the Church in this country.

We must not be deterred from this work by mere pharisaical scandal, or the cry of *insubordination* which may be raised by those who do not at all represent the Episcopacy of this country, and who are bent on perpetuating their inefficiency by appointing men of their own inferior grade. I am working in the true interest of the Episcopacy when I favor the election of men who really represent the Clergy and laity and when I oppose such men as could not obtain five votes in a hundred, even in their own diocese, if the rectors had a say in the elections.

It is the want of ability and of experience in some of our Bishops that is causing the blush to rise constantly to the cheeks of the intelligent and the educated classes of our people, and that causes many of them to grow cold in their religion. This coldness, that we can not deny, is leading to a much worse state of things, and it is the duty of every Priest to try to stop this evil. Do not wait till the laity have lost respect for us and become disgusted with us and with religion through our own fault.

It is very easy to deny the existence of discontent or of any cause for it. Denying it, however, is not removing it. All the Priests of large experience among clergy and laity know too well that such *discontent exists and that it has a cause.* The newspapers place before us from time to time occurrences that force the blush to every catholic cheek, and Catholics feel that these occurences are due, in part, if not mainly, to the want of governing capacity in some of those who are entrusted with the interests of the Church. They do not complain of lack of piety or zeal, or, in most cases, of learning, but they do *complain and most bitterly too, clergy and laity, that they are so poorly represented by those who can not obviate or control the difficulties of themselves and who* often fail to seek aid through the ordinary channels which the Church provides.

Be not afraid of the independent spirit of clergy or laity. Would to God that Catholics of other lands had the same faith and zeal and love for His Church that the American Catholics possess! Let us choose our Bishops. We are well qualified to do so. *If we are not, how comes it that*

those persons who but a few years ago labored in our ranks, and who, in many cases were hardly distinguished in those ranks for extra wisdom or prudence, are now so capable, and the only ones in their own estimation, capable of making episcopal selections?

You ask the prudence of calling public attention to such matters, even granting that they exist. Ask rather the wisdom of applying a remedy. Some things cannot be cured without calling public attention to them. I do not expect to please those who are ignorant of the real state of the Church in the United States, or who are afraid to acknowledge it publicly, or who are eternally preaching silence and so-called prudence in the face of the most glaring abuses. Such persons see nothing but perfect harmony on all sides the result of wonderful ability and prudence.

This is not the remedy. We must face the actual state of things. The Church requires this. Calling public attention to the discontent that exists with the view of applying a remedy may be doing the work of God. It may not be popular with authority just now; but we must look to the future. The Priest who weighs his own personal interests against those of the Church, will not do her much good. Charges of ambition or insubordination is not judging the case according to its own merits.

Anything that tends to create disunion or that fails to maintain union, in the ranks of Clergy or laity should be avoided. In this country people are not inclined to tolerate evils that are easily remedied. Why then place rulers over them that are so illy qualified to rule? Why bring from other dioceses men, perhaps of sufficient ability to govern where they are well known, but who have nothing to recommend them that is not possessed in a much higher degree by those of the same dioceses? The very factor of strength so strongly insisted upon by St. Athanasius and Pope St. Leo, of choosing men of the *same diocese, whose personal influence and practical local knowledge enable them to wield all the moral power of a diocese is almost totally ignored in the* United States. *Is this the law of* the Church? Is *it common sense?* If we desire union why not give us the means of securing it? We say the Priests of such and such a diocese are hardly the proper persons just now to choose a Bishop. Who says so? Perhaps the very person whose appointment has served to bring about this very result.

The result of such appointments are seen every day; such Bishops, feeling the slight hold they have on Priests and people, and being unable to create enthusiasm by their own personal qualities, are disappointed by the coldness which can not conceal itself, blame Priests and people for want of loyalty and zeal. This state of things is by no means confined to a few localities. With our present system of election, it is most difficult to apply a remedy. It is this want of harmony that is doing its fatal work and that is serving as the entering wedge of disunion. If allowed to continue, the time is not very far distant, when Clergy and Laity will begin to lose heart, and, as most of those of Continental Europe of to-day, will be unwilling or unable to render help to the Church when she called on them in the hour of need.

It is silly to charge a Priest with lack of reverence for the Episcopacy, or with some mere personal end, because he speaks out, as the Priest should speak, against evils that exist, and advocates a remedy for those evils. Let us meet the difficulty honestly, and discuss it honestly; ignoring it, or attempting to cover it up, or villifying those who conscientiously call public attention to it, is not applying a remedy; it is only increasing the evil.

In other countries the power of the Episcopacy is circumscribed by Canon Law and the jealousy of the civil power; while the full "faculties" from Rome and the non-interference in matters of religion on the part of the State in this land, *have given our Bishops a supreme and dictatorial power hardly ever wielded by any other body of Bishops in any other time or nation from the foundation of* Christianity. Is it wise to continue this power? Is there a temptation to hold on to this power beyond its proper term?

While there are no people that are more law-abiding or that have more real reverence for law, as such, than the American people, we must ever bear in mind that there are no people that have a more supreme contempt for the arbitrary exercise of absolute power than the same American people.

I am not speaking disparagingly of the Episcopacy, whose learning, virtue and zeal are proofs of the high standing of the Priesthood from whose ranks it is recruited, for it is my very reverence for the illustrious Episcopacy of the United States that makes me advocate a system of election that will add to its lustre, by giving

it in all cases the best men that those ranks can afford, and by making as impossible as is is despicable, the very suspicion of *wire-pulling* or *lobbying* in any and every section of the country. If I do feel warm on this question I cannot help it. I have seen the state of the Church in other lands, and I am not totally ignorant of some of the abuses of election in our own country. *Is it not more prudent to listen with patience to plain but sharp words from one of our own household, though our inferior, than to be forced in after years to submit to the reproaches and the contempt of strangers. The temper of the Clergy and the educated classes of the laity of the United States should be heeded*, for it is one of righteous impatience with the many reproaches to which the inexperience and the want of ability on the part of some of their otherwise pious and amiable guides oblige them to submit.

Our present form of government has done much good, but, though far superior to that system which political complications have forced upon, and to some extent, engrafted upon her, and which have handicapped her, and compelled her to labor at great disadvantages even in the most Catholic countries, still, it fails to give the Church, in many cases, the men whose broad minds, enlarged experience, and high standing among the people, would enable them to wield all the moral power of the diocese in the great battle that is now raging between the world and the Church.

It is the old tale, *submission, submission, submission*, till we have lost heart and hope, and are compelled, in utter despair, to let things have their own way, and we become, perhaps, like a large number of the Catholics of South America and Latin Europe, a very reproach to Mother Church. Give the Church perfect freedom in carrying out her laws, that she may ascertain and select the men that have not only the respect but the confidence and the affection of their flocks. The Church has had enough of the men that were forced upon her by the civil power. She has had enough of the men that forced themselves upon her by their intrigues; she wants men to-day, and the present Pope is crying aloud for such men, *that can wield all the moral power of the diocese* by commanding the heads and the hearts of all classes of its children. Give us, then, a system of electing our Bishops that will secure this end. Such a power is possessed even by the Priests of Ireland, which cannot be called a representa-

tive country, and yet, many of our Bishops are astonished and express alarm for the safety of the Church when such a power is asked by the Clergy of the greatest representative country on the face of the earth, the United States!!

The Clergy have made the Church in this country what she is, the wonder of Christendom, and they deserve the confidence of Rome, and Rome is not only willing but anxious to manifest that confidence through the judgment of the Bishops of the expected Council.

I am appealing to the best class of the Priests whose piety and sound judgment are proof against any charge of ambition or insubordination to exert themselves, before it is too late, in a matter that must influence the Church for better or for worse, even in the far distant future. *Is it not better that such men should agitate this question, than that* it be left to those "tramps" and anonymous writers who have neither the right nor the courage to speak out in behalf of the Priests, and whose efforts can never attract the respectful attention of the Bishops? *This is my own excuse for attempting such a task. I am aware of my great inability, but I believe the cause itself is strong, and I wish to wake up those who are capable of placing it before* the coming Council at Baltimore, *and if necessary afterwards*, before the Propaganda in Rome, with proper force and grace. I believe before God that I am working in the right direction and though I foresee now, as I did in the old pamphlet, no small degree of heated discussion in consequence of my reflections, it is a discussion that will lead to solid good. I neither seek, nor do I value, the approbation of those who are incapable of judging the motives of others save by their own narrow and selfish hearts, and whose zeal for the Church is ever limited by their own mere human interests.

What sound reason can be assigned against the giving of this power to the Clergy? We do not demand it for all the Clergy; but we ask it for a *fair representation* of them. Every *Priest that is capable of discharging the great responsibilities attached to the care of souls in the government of a parish, is certainly a fit person to vote in the election of a Bishop.*

Let the Clergy begin in time to make known their wishes in this matter, and we shall not be obliged to content ourselves with a *mere shadow or mockery of representation*, such

as a few Rectors or a Cathedral Chapter, WHOSE EXISTENCE MAY DEPEND ON NEARLY THE SAME VERY DEFECTIVE MODE OF ELECTION THAT WE ARE NOW LABORING TO REMOVE. Some of those so chosen may perhaps have labored little, if any at all, on the mission: others of them from advanced age, may have little or no sympathy with the living present; and *more of them the mere personal friends of authority*, and who, owing to the continual presence of authority may not have as much independence as to call their souls their own. If we *are to have any power at all, let it be a reality and not a mere excuse for such; let it be a substantial say, or it were much better* that the question be not touched at all. And yet this question should be attended to, for it is certainly the most important one that can come before the Council as it underlies all the other questions, that imperatively demand attention.

The Church in this country *needs representative men, and Clergy and Laity should insist on getting them.* Were we living in other times or in other lands the expression of dissatisfaction would be unavailing, for the simple reason that the State having appointed the Bishop, would compel submission. Things are different here, and as the State takes no action in matters of religion, Rome is perfectly willing to give this country whatever form of government suits her best. Are we unreasonable then, in asking to be governed in a manner befitting the present interests and the future prospects of religion in this land? *Are the best instincts of this country, so favorable to the Catholic Church, to be tortured into conformity with a system of discipline that was partly forced upon the Church and to some extent ingrafted upon her, by State influences? Must the relics of civil tyranny that deprived the Clergy of a vote in the election of Bishops in other times and other lands be maintained and perpetuated in the United States? What excuse can we assign for witholdiny this right from the Clergy? The good of the Church demands an answer to this question and demands it at the present time.* Rome rejoices that she is free from political restraint in this country, and her broad and liberal policy favors the aspirations of Clergy and Laity. Rome is perfectly willing to adapt her discipline to the favorable condition of things in this land, but strange *to say some of our* American *rulers, looking rather to the state of the Church of three hundred years ago, and in lands where the voice of Priests and people was hushed by the iron hand of State, than to the changed condition of the world and to the bright faith and ardent zeal of our independent, though most loyal Priests and people of the United States, shrink from the thought of sharing*

any responsibility even with the foremost among the Clergy. Yes, the old system of a thousand years has produced its effect even upon the Episcopacy of the United States. It is no wonder, indeed, that many of our Bishops hesitate to take such a step, for the Priests have been so long deprived of their rights that it seems to some almost akin to heresy to attempt their restoration.

We should labor to remove the reproaches of our non-Catholic fellow citizens of all denominations, who tell us that we Priests have no voice in the election of our Bishops, *because* the Catholic Church *is opposed to the fundamental characteristic of this government*—REPRESENTATION. We are continually *explaining* to them that this is not the reason of our lacking such a voice; and it is time that the occasion of such a false charge should cease.

The Priests are not asking any thing foreign to their rights in demanding this power. The very Apostles themselves, the Popes, the universal voice of the Episcopacy in the General Councils of the Church, have proclaimed this natural right of the Clergy. This free land, so favorable to the Church, and the high moral and intellectual standard of the American Priesthood, leave no impediment in the way of our enjoying our full canonical rights.

In the very infancy of the Church in the United States, and before there was a single Bishop in all its vast domain, the few old pioneer-Priests, with truly Catholic, as well as, American instinct, petitioned the Pope for the power of electing the Bishops, alleging, even then, that the plan of election by the Clergy was the best for this country, and the one most fitted to root the Catholic Church into American soil by harmonizing it with the genius and the institutions of the Great American Republic. The Pope, too, *grants to them this power, though only for the one occasion, and a nobler man has never worn the mitre in* America, *than the one whom the Priests chose*—John Carroll—the first Catholic Bishop of the United States. Is there any reason to suppose that the Priests of today would fail to give us men of the same energy of character, as Bishop Carroll, who would surround themselves with persons of their own stamina?

We only ask for the Church in America what St. Peter, the first Pope, allowed, and what Leo, the present Pope is willing to grant, what our own crying needs demand; and what the spirit of this great country craves—*the voice of the Clergy in the election of the Bishops.*

I will now conclude this pamphlet in the very words of the

old one: "I have already amply apolgized for my apparent indiscretion in attempting to address you on so important a matter and also for my very crude way of doing it. The crudeness is hardly my fault, for I am incapable of doing better, owing to my inexperience in the use of the pen. I have asked no one's advice or help to enable me to put the matter decently before you. For, though I feel I am expressing the sentiments of nearly every Priest in the land, as well as of the Laity, and at least of some of the Bishops, I try to express them in my own rough, rude manner, rather than compromise any person by a step which some timorous people may severely blame.

I do not intend to be wanting in due reverence for those whom God has placed over the Church in this Country. If in my attempting to express my zeal for the Church any shadow of want of the most humble submission should appear, it must not be attributed to my heart, but to the unskilled use of the pen. Love for the Church means love for those who rule it, and I trust I shall never be wanting in either. I have simply the real good of the Church at heart.

My words have a certain querulous tone; I feel this myself, but I cannot well help it. I have seen the lamentable state of things in Europe, and it has made my heart sick. I see certain tendencies in this country that are calculated to inflict lasting injury on the Church. I feel, as every Priest must feel, that an end should be put to them. If a man tries honestly to remedy those matters, must he be looked upon, as a matter of course, as devoid of a proper ecclesiastical spirit? Is he supposed to have lost his judgment and to have placed a weapon in the hands of the enemies of the Church to injure her?

Is not calling attention to the evil that assails the Church one of the best ways of building up the Church in this country? Are we to wait till these evils have rotted the very vitals of the Church, and then show zeal when it is too late? If my neighbor's house is on fire and only a few sparks should fall on my own roof, is it not prudent to extinguish them? Is it well to spend our time in lamenting abuses when the remedy is in our own hands?

The lesson taught us by the misfortunes of the Church in Europe should not be lost sight of. Give us the men of real influence among Priests and Laity if you want a union that will withstand the power of demagogues and revolutions. But to preserve and increase the growth of the Church in the United States, *give to us such men at once.*

The sad condition of the Church in Italy, France, and Spain has certainly increased my anxiety, while it has intensified my

love for the Church in this land, and should I appear to some persons to manifest an undue alarm for the future, it is because she is the most flourishing vine in the great vineyard of God in the cultivation of which I have labored for twenty-three years under the hottest rays of the burning sun.

Trusting that my voice, however feeble, may reach the ears of the great and the good men in whose hands are the destinies of the Church in this favored land,

I remain your servant in Christ,

PATRICK CORRIGAN.

Church of Our Lady of Gr ce of Hoboken, N. J."

~~DUE JUN. 23 1936~~

~~DEC 0 1 1970~~